DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 270 SO 021 398

TITLE	Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE. Proceedings of a Getty Center for Education in the Arts National Invitational Seminar (Austin, Texas, May 4-7, 1989).
INSTITUTION	Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, CA.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	108p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Aesthetic Education; Art Criticism; *Art Education; Art History; Art Products; Curriculum Development; *Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Multicultural Education; *Role of Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Discipline Based Art Education

ABSTRACT

Proceedings from a seminar devoted to a discussion of issues related to discipline-based art education (DBAE), this document features three scholars addressing a given topic from the perspective of their particular discipline and experience in the field. Six topics were explored: (1) "New Voices on the Integration of Art Disciplines"; (2) "New Voices on Cognition and Teaching"; (3) "New Voices on Multicultural Concerns"; (4) "New Voices on Growing Up with Philosophy and Aesthetics"; (5) "New Voices on Evaluation and DBAE Teaching Effectiveness"; and (6) "Familiar Voices Respond to the New Voices and Reflect Upon Three Generations." A summary of the remarks of the three scholars on each of the six topics is included as well as a summary of the work of discussion groups that were formed around each of the topics. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SEMINAR

PROCEEDINGS

Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE

May 4–7, 1989

Austin, Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Vicki Rosenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 021 398

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SEMINAR

PROCEEDINGS

Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE

May 4–7, 1989

Austin, Texas

A National Invitational Seminar Sponsored by

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

© 1990 The J. Paul Getty Trust
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts
1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300
Los Angeles, CA 90067–2561

Seminar summaries prepared by
Keens Company, New York, New York

William Keens, President and Project Director
Bruce Peyton, Project Managing Editor
Caroline Keens, Project Associate
Rebecca Lewis, Project Associate
Kenna Simmons, Project Associate

Amy L. Walsh, Editor
Pamela Sharp, Editor
Kurt Hauser, Designer, J. Paul Getty Trust Publications
William Robles, Illustrator

Table of Contents

FOREWORD
Leilani Lattin Duke v
WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS
Phillip Charles Dunn vii
Maurice Sevigny ix

SESSION SUMMARIES 1
Triangulation #1: 3
New Voices on the Integration of Art Disciplines
Inside, Outside Inside, Out 3
Ed Emshwiller
Expanding Forms and Visions: The Emergence and History of Video Art 4
John G. Hanhardt
Representational Reciprocity: The Correlation of Media and Modes of
Representation with the Changing Practices of Artist, Critic, and Historian 5
Richard Shiff

Triangulation #2: 8
New Voices on Cognition and Teaching
Perry Levels and Belenky's Recent Findings: Their Possibilities in the
Teaching of Art and Art History 8
John S. Crawford
The Function of Domain-Specific Knowledge in Understanding Works of Art 10
Judith Koroscik
Cognitive Science and Art Education: Contrary Strangers or Natural Allies? 11
Thomas J. Shuell
Discussion Groups 13

Triangulation #3: 23
New Voices on Multicultural Concerns
Cross-Cultural Understanding of Visual Objects: Three Approaches 23
Jacques Maquet
The Study of Art with a Global Perspective: The Adaptation of Maquet's
Ideas on Aesthetics to Multicultural Issues for Discipline-Based Art Education 25
Eldon Katter
Brunswick Stew 27
E. Barry Gaither
Discussion Groups 30

Triangulation #4: 41
New Voices on Growing up with Philosophy and Aesthetics
Objects, Ideas, and Aesthetics 41
Philip Yenawine
Teaching Aesthetics: Philosophical Inquiry in the DBAE Classroom 43
Marilyn Stewart
On the Craft and Art of Dialogue 45
Ronald Reed
Discussion Groups 47

Triangulation #5: 57
New Voices on Evaluation and DBAE Teaching Effectiveness
Art and the Quality of Life 57
Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi
Assessing Art Teaching and Learning: Legitimacy, Limits, and Leadership 59
Jane Maitland-Gholson
Examining Our Assumptions: What Should Art History Teachers Know?
How Should We Measure It? 61
Suzanne M. Wilson
Discussion Groups 64

Triangulation #6: 74
Familiar Voices Respond to the New Voices and Reflect Upon Three Generations of DBAE Implementation
The New Pluralism and Discipline-Based Art Education 74
Ralph A. Smith
Structures and Experience: Response from the Second Generation 76
Mary Ann Stankiewicz
Group Statement: Remarks from the Third Generation 78

SPECIAL SESSION 81
An Unexpected Educational Outcome: Questioning the Theory, Concerns and Reservations about DBAE 83
A Response to "Questioning the Theory"
Phillip Charles Dunn, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts 86

PARTICIPANTS 91

Foreword

by Leilani Lattin Duke

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts is pleased to share the proceedings from its second seminar on timely issues related to discipline-based art education (DBAE). The contents of this volume reflect the ideas, discussions, and debates that occurred in Austin, Texas during three days in May 1989. Over 120 art education academics and art and museum education practitioners, plus a dozen doctoral students in art education, came from across the nation to explore and examine the theory and practice of DBAE.

The seminar was structured to build upon the ideas and concerns that had arisen during our first issues seminar in May 1987. The Austin program featured a unique format in which three scholars each addressed a given topic from the perspective of his or her particular discipline and experience in the field. In all, the seminar explored six topics in plenary sessions; small group sessions followed all but the first and concluding general convocations. One of the major goals of the seminar was to incorporate the ideas of younger scholars, those whom the seminar director, Dr. Maurice Sevigny, and his planning committee identified as the third generation of scholars who will continue the evolution of DBAE.

Those who attended the seminar will note that these proceedings also contain two papers that were not actually presented during the seminar itself. We are pleased to include a summary of the seminar written by doctoral student participants; and a "minority report," which shares the concerns of a group of approximately thirty participants who met in an ad hoc session during the conference to continue the discussion about DBAE and the role of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in its development.

We recognize that the theoretical underpinnings of DBAE must be constantly developed and challenged, and the Center welcomes constructive contributions that will nurture the examination of issues crucial to the development of this approach to art education.

Although written proceedings generally lack the passion and intensity of the remarks that were made by presenters and respondents, we have attempted to relate these ideas and comments as clearly and as objectively as possible. We hope that you find them stimulating and informative.

Welcome

by Phillip Charles Dunn

On behalf of myself and my colleagues at the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, I would like to extend to you a warm welcome to our second national invitational seminar on issues in discipline-based art education (DBAE). We are pleased to continue our support for systematic and extended investigations of the theoretical basis of DBAE. By providing opportunities such as this for scholars to discuss and challenge DBAE, we hope to expand and strengthen the theoretical foundations on which it is based.

This seminar is designed to build upon the information and synergy that resulted from our initial seminar, "Issues in Discipline-Based Art Education: Strengthening the Stance, Extending the Horizons," which was held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in May 1987. Each of you should have received a copy of the proceedings from that seminar in the materials you were given before your arrival. I hope you found these proceedings stimulating and thought-provoking in preparation for this meeting.

The advancement of DBAE theory in art education is one of five areas supported by the Center for Education in the Arts, one of the seven operating entities of the Getty Trust. Other areas of endeavor include: advocacy, professional development, curriculum development, and programs that demonstrate DBAE in action. In addition to our issues seminars, we seek to advance this theory through the periodic publication of essays, occasional papers, monographs by leading scholars in art education and related fields, and proceedings from our conferences and seminars. Over the next three years, we will work in collaboration with the University of Illinois Press to publish a five-volume series that will translate DBAE theory into practical application.

"Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE" represents the concerted effort of many dedicated art educators, discipline experts, and scholars to examine the tenets of DBAE from multifaceted points of view. Maurice Sevigny and his planning committee—Paul Bolin, Anne El-Omami, and Marilyn Stewart—have created a wonderful program, which reflects the great amount of time and effort they have each contributed to planning and conducting this seminar. My colleagues and I are grateful to them for their dedication, enthusiasm, and professionalism. The planning process for this weekend, which spanned more than a year, was marked by openness and flexibility in determining the overall organization, the topics for discussion, and the individuals who would participate. There was never a shortage of ideas from this group. As a result, they have enlisted an exciting roster of distinguished and knowledgeable speakers, who will explore and, we expect, illuminate both the theoretical issues and current practice of DBAE.

This seminar represents a conscious effort on the part of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and the seminar plan-

ning team to provide a forum for newer scholars in our field. We fully realize that DBAE, like any other educational initiative, must continue to grow and evolve, not only in terms of the theoretical base that supports it, but also in terms of the modes we ultimately choose for its implementation. We also know that in order for this approach to remain relevant, especially in an era of educational reformation such as ours, it must appeal to and be informed by theorists and practitioners alike. Therefore, we invite you to participate in and contribute to the evolution of DBAE.

As a group, you are poised to move art education programs into the next century. In large part, your efforts will determine what constitutes education in art and the position art occupies within the educational schema for the next and succeeding generations. It is our hope that during the next three days you will find opportunities to listen and speak out, to learn and inform, and to lend your voices to those who are already examining DBAE as a means for positive change in the classrooms of this nation.

Thank you very much.

Opening Remarks

by Maurice Sevigny

Ladies and gentlemen, at long last we are about to begin what promises to be an exciting four days in a very pleasant professional conference environment. As the director of the project, it is my honor to welcome each of you to the second DBAE issues symposium, "Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on Discipline-Based Art Education."

The theme of the conference is "triangulation." This concept of considering an issue from multiple perspectives is not unique to the social sciences. In his classic anthropological study published in 1961, *The Children of Sanchez*, Oscar Lewis developed the concept of the "multi-faceted panoramic view." In the early 1970s, Kenneth Beittel introduced art educators to the term "Rashomon effect," taken from the classic Japanese film that portrayed the same event from several points of view. Along the same lines, in the 1970s I promoted "triangulated inquiry," a research methodology for the study of art education that supports taking multiple perspectives for case study research—multiple observation stances, multiple research and data collection strategies, and a variety of analytic techniques to achieve more fully integrated results. Those of you who are familiar with my work are aware of my commitment to triangulation as a study technique. This conference is an extension of that strategy.

Discipline-based art education (DBAE) is an integrated concept that focuses on the art object through a combination of the curriculum content from the four disciplines of art. Thus, it seems fitting that we depart from the usual format of singularly featured experts and adopt a format where three speakers will each consider the same topic from the perspective of his or her own discipline and experience. This will allow us to triangulate prior frames of reference that individually have proven inadequate for the implementation of DBAE theory in teaching practice. The format of the conference will triangulate the perspectives of three generations of educators of art teachers with the research knowledge of outside specialty scholars and the practical skills of professionals engaged in the process of inquiry within the various art disciplines. Our plan is also triangulated to overlap these combined perspectives with the elements of educational change.

Our triangulation design will provide an important forum for three generations of teacher educators, where the newer voices can interact with the familiar and historical voices that have promoted the basic tenets of DBAE. Experienced teacher educators and scholars will have the opportunity to listen and respond to the new generation, who will either advance the theory or abandon it.

An important component of the conference, therefore, is the participation of a group of dynamic doctoral students, who will benefit from networking, as well as contribute an important perspective to our discussions. I am personally very proud of

this aspect. When I wrote my DBAE antecedent paper, I realized how important the Penn State seminar was in the sixties. One of the reasons for its success was that the senior mentors, the leading professionals of art education, brought their graduate students. They primed the next generation, who were to assume the responsibility for their thinking. Thus, I proposed to the Getty Center that this project support, through scholarships, ten of the most dynamic young doctoral students who are working on issues related to DBAE. They are here with us—the new faces on the horizon, the new voices of the next generation of art teachers.

Our seminar plan is triangulated on several levels. One is related to the site, which we chose to heighten the spirit of innovation and change. It has been said that without pause there can be no music. Many seminars fail to recognize the importance of balancing the intensity of novel ideas with sufficient opportunity for physical activity to encourage the personal interpretation and application that can result from relaxed pause. Barton Creek Conference Resort and Fitness Center is a state-of-the-art facility that is isolated to encourage the triangulation of mind, body, and soul. I hope you will take advantage of the special resources of this conference center.

We have also included in the program a display of curriculum resources to show participants some of the current curriculum materials that are oriented toward art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. Through discussions, seminar committee members identified sixteen publishers of art curriculum materials, each of which they invited to submit display materials as well as literature for distribution to participants at the seminar. Fourteen publishers responded to the invitation. We hope you will enjoy the opportunity to explore these materials.

We do not expect that all the perspectives presented at the conference will converge upon one reality or one point of view. In fact, those of you who work with triangulation know that frequently what happens is that those points do not converge. They are oftentimes contradictory. Our plan is to provide an opportunity for issues to converge by presenting three different and unique points of view on perplexities that face DBAE. We assume that you, as intelligent and successful practitioners and participants, can assign personal priority to those issues in some way and go beyond the theory, go beyond the name-brand DBAE and start developing your own generic brands via the refined interpretation of your experiences at Barton Creek. Our hope is that you will take some of the ideas from this conference, refine them, and give them back to the profession in ways that are exciting and insightful. We have faith that you will do that. You were selected because of your leadership and ability to think independently and creatively. Several of you have expressed serious concern about DBAE in the past. We welcome your views and look forward to discussing with all of you our emerging perspective on the future of DBAE.

Before I conclude, I would like to recog-

nize the planning team: Marilyn Stewart, a member of the art education faculty at Kutztown University; Anne El-Omami, a museum educator formerly with the Spencer Museum and now with the Cincinnati Art Museum; and Paul Bolin, who is on the faculty at the University of Oregon in Eugene. These conferences do not happen overnight; without the input and hard work of these dedicated people, this event would not be the success we expect it to be. I would also like to acknowledge the staff of the Barton Creek Conference Resort with whom I worked and Anne Elmajian, who attended to the 101 details involved in making this conference a reality. I am also grateful to Mary Jane Coughlin, my secretary at the University of Texas, who took a personal interest and great pride in assisting me with this project.

Finally, I would like to recognize the Getty staff, who worked hard to make this conference possible: Leilani Lattin Duke, Stephen Dobbs, Vicki Rosenberg, and especially Phillip Dunn, our project director. The Center should be applauded: we proposed some issues that really go off in left field or right field, and we selected a format that is unique; yet, the Getty Center was both receptive and eager that we implement our ideas. We got the program that we asked for. I am grateful to the Getty Center for taking the risk, for being flexible and open to new voices and ideas regarding DBAE. In all respects during the planning of this conference, our relationship with the Getty Center has been very positive and exciting; it has been a particular pleasure to work with Lani Duke, Phil Dunn, and the Getty staff. I know you join me in my appreciation of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and their capable staff.

Issues Seminar Director,
Maurice Sevigny

Session Summaries

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Triangulation #1:
New Voices on the Integration of Art Disciplines

SPEAKERS
Ed Emshwiller
Dean, School of Film and Video, California Institute of the Arts

John G. Hanhardt
Head, Film and Video, Whitney Museum of American Art

Richard Shiff
Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Modernism, The University of Texas, Austin

Top: Richard Shiff
Left: John G. Hanhardt
Right: Ed Emshwiller

Summary of Remarks by Ed Emshwiller

Ed Emshwiller focused his remarks on why, as an artist, he works with computers and video to make art. For him, there are three imperatives for the production of art: the internal need to create imaginative works, the assimilation of perceptions of the world, and the presentation of ideas through image-making tools.

Emshwiller began as a painter and illustrator but has moved to other forms of artistic expression. One reason for this change was his desire to deal with time. He began by mounting a camera over his drawing board and making 16mm films of his paintings, which he repainted again and again. Transformation, thus, became part of the actual structure of his works. When he started making movies, all his painter friends said, "That's not art. That's technology." But Emshwiller was well aware that as a painter he had been using a much older technology—pigments, brushes, and canvas. When he moved to video, his filmmaking friends said, "That's not art. That's technology." It seems to be a repeating pattern: when you no longer use the tools people expect you to use, they feel betrayed.

Emshwiller finds video more spontaneous and less inhibiting than film; in that respect, it is like returning to painting. But video, unlike painting, is collaborative. For example, in making *Sunstone*, a work that uses computers, he was helped by scientists and technicians. The challenge for an artist working in collaboration with others is not only critical, theoretical, or aesthetic, it is also social. In order to be adept at making films and videotapes, Emshwiller believes the artist must be able to handle four things: the art, the economics of time and money, the technology, and other people. Part of his evolution as an artist has been moving from what he terms a "very egocentric position as a painter," where the burden of responsibility was his alone, to a position similar to that of a composer/conductor. What counts is how he and his collaborators bring things together.

Computers are liberating for Emshwiller as an artist, because they allow him to preserve different stages in the development of a work—something he could not do as a painter. Working with a computer, you do not have to start from scratch each time, and you can try this or that variation until you get just what you want. Another advantage is controlled randomness: in *Skin Matrix*, sculpted faces alternate with live images of a woman's face, and rectangular forms appear and disappear within the image of a woman's body. The computer

allowed Emshwiller to define a randomness within a specific area, offering a certain kind of control.

The tools Emshwiller uses, whether paint brushes, movie cameras, or video synthesizers, all demand that he think differently within their individual limitations and capabilities. It is exciting, he says, because it forces him constantly to rethink things, and it keeps him from repeating himself.

Summary of Remarks by John G. Hanhardt

Reflecting on the relationship of technology and art, John Hanhardt spoke about the emergence of video as an art form. The divisions between art forms are changing, due to the new technologies that are informing intertextual and cross-cultural means of exploration. Yet, as Hanhardt observed, art has always been closely allied with technology. A hundred years ago, photography, and later the cinema, revolutionized how we see the world, adding new methods of depiction and representation to the changes wrought by modernism. Likewise, today various technologies are having a powerful impact on art. Computers, television, and video cameras and recorders are part of an electronic universe in which one must look differently at the very concept of the work of art.

Video art first established itself as an aesthetic discourse in the late fifties and sixties, when artists began to break down the divisions between media and to explore the impermanence of performance and dance. They challenged cultural institutions by creating works that did not fit into orthodox categories and definitions. Wolf Vostell and Nam June Paik were key figures at the beginning of video art; one of the major institutions whose authority these artists confronted was broadcast television. Paik, in particular, attempted to demystify and humanize technology through a series of multi-monitor installations that transformed television sets into works of art.

During subsequent years, video art has become a catalyst, helping to create a multi-

media aesthetic that offers new metaphors and models, and its history has become a model for the future changes in our visual culture. In recent years, artists have developed a new means of representation. Buky Schwartz, for example, created a "video-construction" in which a piece of sculpture seems to occupy a gallery through closed-circuit and real-time processes of the video camera and monitor. Mary Lucier's *Ohio at Giverny*, a meditation on the artist's Ohio birthplace and Monet's garden at Giverny, constitutes an art historical dialogue. Artists and critics are also using new technological tools to address social and political issues. The basis of the image itself has been transformed through technologies that can create abstract, realistic, or artificial images, forcing the redefinition of representation and realism.

In these and other works, art history, technology, theory, and practice are joined, not to duplicate the past, but to produce a new form of imagery based on the relationship between depiction and perception. As artists devise new models and experiment with new kinds of "canvases" and "paints," they begin to establish the aesthetics of the future—a future we can see projected in the history of video art.

Summary of Remarks by Richard Shiff

At the beginning of his remarks, Richard Shiff introduced a new paradigm for artistic representation: what he calls "representational reciprocity." Works of art almost always involve multiple modes of representation; in fact, the interaction between two or more such modes probably generates the meanings of a work. We experience representational reciprocity (the give and take of representational signs) when one medium "plays off" another, as sound and image do in films.

Shiff cited two works by Jasper Johns as examples: *Numbers in Color* and *0 Through 9*. Both involve the use of stenciled numbers within a pictorial structure characterized by free brushwork; both draw attention to (and represent) numbers and the technique of stenciling. Stenciling, itself, is a mode of representation with its own connotations. Therefore, by using personalized brush marks together with the standardized set of stenciled figures, Johns causes these two modes of figuration to interfere with each other; indeed, that is the subject of his work. Shiff argues that Johns's methods are parallel to (or inspired by) the proliferation of media in our culture and that representational reciprocity is, in fact, quite common.

One of the effects of this has been to force art educators to confront the question of what constitutes a work of art. This is complicated by the fact that an artwork is not only an object but also a "work," a process of making, or as Shiff defines it, a representation both of objects and of internal processes and states of mind. Art repre-

sents by showing or referring to something directly and by performing the work of representation; it is "representation in process."

To perform this feat, art employs one medium to act on another. A work of art (a representation) involves some kind of transformation, transference, or metaphor—something is converted into something else—and it is the medium that performs the conversion. Even in working from nature or expressing his or her own feelings, the artist does not capture a neutral object within the chosen medium; his/her attempt to represent something forces a recognition of the conventions and limitations of habitual seeing. Thus, artistic endeavors always involve the interplay of media and modes of representation.

For example, if Shiff chooses to express his feelings through painting, he is limited to whatever modes of representation are considered expressive. Because of the interference of critical discourse, he may not be able to make a painting that is both expressive and sincere. Instead, he may find himself trapped between what seem to be the appropriate modes of representation (as defined by history) and a discourse that has caused those modes to lose their primary expressive function. Thus, critical writing operates as another medium of representation.

The history of modern art provides a number of examples of the effect one medium has on another. Shiff cited *Back of the Mike*, a film in the representational mode associated with pop culture and documentary efforts that may or may not be identified as art making. *Back of the Mike*, which was made in 1937 about the production of a radio show, represents temporality but, as Shiff points out, not in any natural state. The film has been organized to fit another representational medium—radio—which has its own temporal framework. As a film, the work interferes with what we understand about radio, because it presents a visual representation of an auditory environment. Where does meaning lie—in the visual or the auditory?

All media tend to confuse information that comes from the working of different senses. In the works by Jasper Johns, two kinds of hand movement are conflated—stenciling, which seems standardized, and brush-stroking, which seems particularized. In *Back of the Mike*, film modifies the version of reality presented by radio, and the modes of representation conflict: "Shorty" is not short, "Junior" is not young, and the contrivances behind radio sound effects are exposed by the visual rendering. Indeed, the film negotiates the differences rather than suppresses them, as ordinary discourse would do; thus the narrative has been transformed to fit the requirements of radio, and radio has been transformed to suit the requirements of film.

How does the examination of media come to bear on art education? Shiff advocates encouraging art educators to consider alternatives to the traditionally accepted ideas of artistic representation—the mimetic paradigm. In our media culture, it may be more appropriate to consider a paradigm

that deals with the proliferation of meanings and ironies resulting from the interference of one medium with another. We are, after all, surrounded by images, not by nature.

Triangulation #2:
New Voices on Cognition and Teaching

Top: Thomas J. Shuell
Left: Judith Koroscik
Right: John S. Crawford

SPEAKERS
John S. Crawford
Department of Art History, University of Delaware

Judith Koroscik
Department of Art Education, Ohio State University

Thomas J. Shuell
Department of Counseling and Education Psychology, State University of New York, Buffalo

Summary of Remarks by John S. Crawford
John Crawford addressed the findings of William G. Perry, Jr., and Mary F. Belenky concerning a common pattern in the mental maturation of college students and the gender differences that affect the model. Perry divided his model into nine stages, or "Perry levels"; research indicates that students go through all the stages, but at different rates of change. Three factors—temporizing (a pause in development), retreat (regression to a previous level), and escape (fatalistic acceptance)—affect progressive development.

When students begin college, they are usually in levels 1-3, which Perry calls "dualism": they want absolutes, and they look upon teachers as possessors of absolute knowledge. In levels 4-6, which Perry calls "multiplicity," students confront alternative, conflicting ideas, all of which they consider equally valid. Success appears to come from discovering and delivering what authorities want. In the final stage, levels 7-9, which Perry terms "commitment," students realize that knowledge is contextual and open to challenges. They also understand that they must make commitments in order to function. At these levels, students see authorities as fellow seekers of knowledge.

As students move into level 2, they begin to see conflicts between authorities—a modification of dualism. In level 3, they recognize that some questions exist for which authorities have no answers, but they believe that the authorities are working on these problems and will solve them. Level 4 brings the first major transition, as students become aware of many possible solutions to problems but are unequipped to choose among them. Choices seem arbitrary, and there is no sense of detachment. Multiplicity changes to relativism in level 5, when students begin to use logic to select among alternatives. This is the second great transition. In level 6, which Perry calls "commitments in relativism," students realize that they must make choices in a relativistic construct. They begin to compare their work to that of others and to separate themselves from their work. Finally, in level 9, students come to see that, although their lives will still be uncertain, they will have to make commitments in order to continue.

Perry almost exclusively studied male students; however, Belenky studied both men and women, focusing on possible differences in their development. She found that while the basic model held, the reactions of men and women to the different stages of development differed significantly.

The results of Belenky's research showed that men tend to identify with their teachers, to enjoy competing, and to see knowledge as objective. Belenky calls this "separate knowing." In contrast, she found that women tend not to identify with teachers and to think of knowledge as specific and arising from within the self—knowledge can be intuited rather than analyzed. Female students seem to see challenges from teachers as threats to their sense of self and often respond with a desire to retreat, temporize, or escape. Women tend to rely on a parallel development of a positive self-concept—what Belenky calls "gaining a voice." They think of themselves as part of a group more than men do. In gaining a voice, they pass through stages that Belenky calls "received knowledge," "subjective knowledge," and "constructed knowledge." Moving from received to subjective knowledge, women begin to feel the need to listen to themselves rather than to others. They tend to fear being ostracized and to be cautious in accepting multiplicity. Later, in the subjective knowledge stage, women begin to break old bonds and establish their own identities; they feel more conflict than men, because they tend to define themselves in terms of relationships.

The next step in Belenky's model is "procedural knowing," the search for ways to understand different views. Though some women, like male "separate knowers," detach themselves from the process of knowing, most women tend to engage in "connected knowing" through empathy with the people who hold different views. Belenky's last step, "constructed knowledge," is similar to Perry's commitment. There is still a difference between separate and connected knowers: separate knowers analyze self-concepts through logic, while connected knowers attempt to discover areas of the self through relating to others.

Some educators have argued that the value of Perry's original study was limited because its subjects were overwhelmingly white and middle to upper class. Belenky's study included blacks, Hispanics, and non-students. Again, she found Perry's model generally valid, but she did note that racism and ethnocentrism can affect the developmental process.

Students at different Perry levels have different needs and capabilities. In Perry levels 1-2, they view information as something to be received, and they attempt to prove that they have learned the right answers. A classroom approach emphasizing ambiguity may be frustrating to them, since they expect a more rigid structure. At level 5 and above, the opposite is the case. Students want a diversity of approaches. What remains the same, however, is the student's desire to feel close to the teacher, who, although no longer seen as omniscient, is valued as a colleague engaged in the same pursuits. Crawford suggests that teachers can aid the developmental process by explaining to students that some parts of the material will be more difficult than others; they could also help students by explaining the material in both concrete and abstract terms. Teachers should encourage small-group work to reduce competition and balance challenges with safety to ward off discouragement.

Summary of Remarks by Judith Koroscik

Judith Koroscik focused her talk on the contributions of domain-specific, or discipline knowledge, to a person's understanding of art. Specifically, she addressed the impact of prior knowledge of art on an individual's comprehension of a work of art, and sought to define how the understandings of novices and experts differ.

Research shows that the ways in which less successful and more advanced students approach learning differ both qualitatively and quantitatively. One difference is in conceptual or declarative knowledge—what the person already knows about the material (i.e., an expert knows more than a novice). Another difference is in procedural knowledge—what the person draws upon to devise strategies for using what he or she already knows. Educators should consider both types of knowledge, since a learner can have conceptual knowledge of a discipline and yet be unable to access the knowledge to develop new understandings. Koroscik cautioned that although the examples she gave of the characteristics of less successful and more successful learners appear to establish a dichotomy, in fact, they are steps in a continuum.

Koroscik referred to the work of David Perkins and Rebecca Simmons, which differentiates between four types of knowledge or "frames of understanding": content, problem solving, epistemology, and inquiry. In each, the knowledge ranges from domain-specific to domain-general and includes conceptual and procedural knowledge. The content frame contains facts, details, and definitions of the domain, in addition to content-specific procedural knowledge. In art, this might be the understanding a person has of a single discipline concept—Picasso's use of color to convey meaning in *Guernica*, for example. The second frame, problem-solving, may include specialized study skills, strategies for directing the search for information, and ways to detect any failure to understand. It requires considerable knowledge of content. Using the Picasso example, a learner would be able to define the problem—interpreting the meaning of *Guernica*—and realize that he or she needs to extend the search for information beyond simply looking at the work.

The epistemic frame involves norms and strategies used to validate claims in the discipline, including giving reasons for an interpretation. To evaluate Picasso's use of color in *Guernica*, a person would know to consider how that fit within the history of art and how one could use art historical references as evidence. The inquiry frame consists of strategies that challenge knowledge in a domain, including critical and creative thinking (which is often a characteristic of an expert). A child may have certain understandings about particular works but fail to integrate them into theories about art. Instruction in the inquiry frame might rectify this problem; for example, children might consider how various works of art influenced Picasso's painting *Guernica* or how Picasso's work influenced other artists, thus extending their theories about how color can be used to convey meaning.

Koroscik noted that there is little understanding of how misconceptions formed by art learners occur and operate. One approach to gathering evidence is to look at art viewers whose backgrounds and expertise levels vary, examining how people form new understandings of artworks under different conditions. Koroscik found that many novices operate under a "spirit of conviction" rather than under the "spirit of exploration" that is common to experts. For example, novices conclude that there is a single reason why Picasso limited his palette to black and white; they do not develop multiple explanations.

These findings should lead us to question the teaching practices that cause students to believe there is a single valid interpretation for a work of art. Koroscik points out that many instructional materials present extremely simplified information about *Guernica*—that is, discrete facts without explanation. Educators should remember that all students, even very young ones, need to understand the relevance of the information that is being presented to them.

Students need help developing their knowledge of domain-specific facts, details, and definitions in order to advance in metacognitive areas. They also need strategies for transferring existing knowledge beyond its original context. Teaching should be geared to fostering comprehension of the significance of factual knowledge and the relevance of domain-specific knowledge. This requires assessment of the learner's state of understanding and anticipation of the types of misconceptions that are likely to arise.

Summary of Remarks by Thomas J. Shuell

Thomas Shuell's presentation examined certain facets of cognitive science that have value for art education. These include current conceptions of meaningful learning, ten learning functions that represent psychological processes in which students must engage to achieve meaningful learning, and the relationship between cognition and affect.

Shuell links cognitive science and art education by maintaining that both are concerned with perception, cultural differences, and context. If we acknowledge art as a symbolic activity—involving the formation of symbolic representations that can be linked to other symbols, the use of perception, memory, and understanding to appreciate art, and the interpretation of subtle cues—then a bridge exists between the fields of science and art.

Shuell believes that meaning does not lie in the art object but in the interpretation. The cognitive representations (words and images) that make up this meaning are also symbols. In other words, both the work of art and what we know about it are symbols. To understand these symbols, we must be able to manipulate the symbol systems.

For meaningful learning and understanding to occur, a person must individually process the information into a structured, organized, interrelated body of knowledge. Knowledge does not exist somewhere "out there" but is constructed by each individual, using both visual and verbal formats. Instructors must allow students to construct their own interpretations of artworks and

content and give them feedback on the validity of their constructs.

Thus, the learner must construct his own interpretation to receive the existing knowledge communicated by the instructor. Further, existing knowledge is dynamic; if the learner is to understand and retain material, new information must be elaborated (the learner must add his or her information) and related to other information, and prior knowledge—including misinterpretations—must be taken into account. Finally, teachers must realize that learning is goal-oriented; if optimal learning is to occur, instructional activities must be planned, progress must be monitored, and techniques must be evaluated. The teacher assists, but the learner must "buy into" the goal.

Meaningful learning requires that the learner accomplish ten psychological functions. The way in which they are performed is less crucial than whether or not they are performed. They can be initiated by the teacher or the learner. The functions are

1) *expectations*, the nature of the goal and the student's perceptions of his or her ability to reach it;

2) *attention*, the features of the learning task that the student notices;

3) *encoding*, the initial recording of the material, which determines what is selected for processing;

4) *comparison*, identifying the relationship between what is being learned and what the learner already knows;

5) *hypothesis generation*, identifying alternatives or possible solutions to the instructional problem;

6) *repetition*, preferably in different contexts and with different examples;

7) *feedback* on the appropriateness or viability of the learner's responses;

8) *evaluation* of the feedback by the learner to determine the adequacy of responses;

9) *monitoring*, to determine progress toward the goal;

10) *combination, integration, and synthesis* of material, the final process that is essential to meaningful learning.

In closing, Shuell noted that cognition and affect must be seen as intertwined, especially in art education, which deals with affective factors such as the learner's self-perceptions. The relationship between the two is reciprocal: we interpret feelings using cognitive processes, and our perceptions and thoughts occur in an "affective bath," with thoughts influenced by feelings. We cannot ignore one in favor of the other when discussing learning. A student who is feeling bored and listless while visiting an art gallery is likely to have a very different interpretation of events and objects than a student who is excited and intellectually challenged. The secret of good teaching, then, is to recognize the complex relationships between cognitive science and art education and to interweave them accordingly.

Friday Morning Breakout Sessions: New Voices on Cognition and Teaching

GROUP A

GROUP LEADER

Enid Zimmerman

PARTICIPANTS

Terry Barrett, Donna Kay Beattie, Margaret Burchenal, John S. Crawford, Sandra Epps, Susan R. Euler, Dennis Fehr, William Hoey, Michael Kendall, Beverly W. Krieger, Richard LaTour, Stanley S. Madeja, Connie Newton, Michael E. Ott, Vicki Rosenberg, Robert L. Russell, Mary Ann Stankiewicz, Frances Thurber, Philip Yenawine

---

The discussion centered on four primary themes:

1) the application of cognitive theories to the development of DBAE curriculum scope and sequence for students of all ages and developmental levels;

2) a tolerance for ambiguity in the incorporation of cognitive theories into DBAE;

3) an emphasis on the process of metacognition for both teachers and students;

4) the humanization of DBAE through the provision of a sensitive, holistic education for students.

A number of group members shared their experiences in successfully applying cognitive theories to art classes for students in grades K-12 and to art methods classes at the college level. It was agreed that more is known about teaching art production than is known about teaching art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. But, although teaching students how to make art has a longer history, it should not be assumed that studio art is taught any more effectively than the other three disciplines. Time is needed to adapt cognitive theories to the learning process in art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and studio art in order to integrate learning across the disciplines.

Some participants, however, felt that the application of cognitive theories to art teaching implies an inflexible, mechanistic approach to teaching and learning. The challenge is to find ways to keep the emotional excitement when we approach teaching in a cognitive way. There are many different forms of learning, and art teachers must relate to individual differences among their students. The teacher must help the student recognize his or her own level and then guide him/her to deeper levels of understanding in the visual arts.

The group also discussed at length the question of how to translate the concept of developmental levels into scope and sequence for curriculum development. Some participants felt that this approach is too theoretical, that no one actually has done it in the classroom. Others disagreed and shared their methods for successfully putting theory into practice. Terry Barrett, for example, discussed his application of Judith Koroscik's thinking to the teaching of criticism.

Philip Yenawine emphasized the need to be tolerant of ambiguity. Art education currently is in a state of flux, and it is important to be patient as people find their way. There are many questions yet to be answered, but in the meantime we must continue training teachers.

For their part, teachers must be sensitive to the fact that each student has a personal, highly individualized learning style. Teaching needs to become more humanistic; in so doing, it would also become more individualized. "In other words," as Enid Zimmerman pointed out, "we should include both the affect or the feeling end of what we are doing and the more cognitive, intellectual approach. We should treat the child holistically, instead of just fragmenting or compartmentalizing him or her."

Everyone agreed that students who are at a higher level of development coming into DBAE should not be valued more than those who begin at a lower level. We should meet students where they are and carefully bring them along to higher levels. Overemphasizing cognitive stages can lead to the dangerous practice of rewarding students who are privileged because of the superior educational background and the higher stage of cognitive development they have attained before they begin the DBAE program.

Zimmerman introduced to the discussion the topic of metacognition, "the idea that perhaps we should share our secrets not only with our methods students but also with the students in the schools." In other words, How are we thinking? Why are we asking these things? What are our thinking processes? What are we trying to accomplish by teaching? We should encourage students to become more reflective about their own cognitive processes—what they are doing and how they are doing it. Self-reflection, on the part of teachers *and* students, leads to enrichment, to greater breadth and depth in the learning process.

GROUP B

GROUP LEADER

Amy Brook Snider

PARTICIPANTS

Nancy Berry, Judith Madden Bryant, Ann Calvert, John C. Chamberlin, Gilbert Clark, Mary Erickson, Hermine Feinstein, Paulette S. Fleming, Lynn Galbraith, George Geahigan, Glenda Gentry, Sharon R. Gray, Eldon Katter, Martin P. Rayala, Becky Reese, Mindy J. Richman, Jeanne Rollins, J. Russell Sale, Richard Shiff, Ralph A. Smith, Jay Ulbricht

---

Most of the group's discussion focused on Judith Koroscik's paper, specifically on the idea of novices and experts. In considering what DBAE can do to help less experienced art viewers become more experienced and whether Koroscik's remarks applied equally to all four disciplines, participants debated the appropriateness of equating novices with less successful learners. Hermine Feinstein pointed out what she called a "category mistake" in Koroscik's chart, which seemed to equate the two. The category of novices, in fact, needs two subcategories: less successful learners and more successful learners, since novices can be either. Feinstein also questioned whether an expert should be considered a learner or someone who is practicing in the field. John Chamberlin suggested labeling the two categories beginner and expert, since a beginner cannot properly be called a less successful learner.

That comment brought the group back to

its original question: How can DBAE help students move from one level to another? Judith Bryant responded that DBAE develops a method of critical inquiry that moves beginners from their initial response to a work of art to raising questions about that work. The challenge exists from kindergarten to grade twelve, and even beyond, since not all novices are children.

Ralph Smith observed that the long-term goals for DBAE must be decided before proponents can begin to talk about implementation and how certain strategies fit in. Mary Erickson agreed; she was inclined to consider the novice/expert categories in terms of the disciplines, examining the relationships, considering whether a teacher should move through all of the stages with all of the students at the same time, and so on. The answer would be dictated by the goals of DBAE, which need to be considered before implementation. She asked the group if they had a consensus to move toward implementation, and she reminded them that, although there are goals stated in the monograph and in the Getty positions, all goals will have ramifications on how cognitive theories are used.

It is also important to consider the cognitive styles of teachers, since teachers choose which form the curriculum will take. Hermine Feinstein commented that, regardless of age, novices, after some evaluation, will be shown to be more or less successful learners. Teaching strategies can, then, be tailored to suit the students, providing remediation where necessary. Paulette Fleming noted that she finds it helpful to tell her undergraduate students in the beginning that they will find some things in DBAE to be difficult and some to be easy, and that each discipline has its own structure. Recognizing that a multiplicity of learning styles and approaches exists makes the students more comfortable.

Talk of remediation led to a discussion of how DBAE could help "at-risk" populations. Mary Erickson suggested that it would be helpful to observe the interactions between pedagogy and content. Some group members felt that a curriculum based on the structure of the four disciplines is helpful for at-risk students, as well as for others, since not all students are prepared for a variety of learning options. A good teacher will recognize this and modify his or her teaching style to provide more structure and respond to the learning styles of the individual students.

The group also considered how to define prior knowledge and how to use it with at-risk groups. Paulette Fleming noted that many students do not value prior experience if it seems to be outside the mainstream. Even after they receive A's in an art course, they still feel that they are not artists. Some way of validating their prior knowledge needs to be found in order to empower students. When doing an assessment, it is also important to help students recognize a skill that they have but of which they may not be aware. Ralph Smith suggested that a sequential curriculum might provide a good framework for teachers to build on the knowledge that students bring with them.

The atmosphere in the classroom also plays a part in the reactions of children. Fleming feels that more research is needed in this area. If it is considered "not cool" to raise your hand and ask or answer questions, how do we encourage children to examine their feelings and ideas? Snider commented that art is often taught in a classroom according to the nineteenth-century notion of how artists behave—working alone at a table, for example. Children never get options such as working in groups. How well are teachers practicing the disciplines if they adhere to this model? Eldon Katter noted that at some point every child thinks he or she is an artist and is very comfortable with producing art, as opposed to participating in the other disciplines. Then at a later point, that feeling stops. If educators strive to make children feel comfortable about dialogue, will the students continue to feel positive about producing art as they mature, or will they, too, lose interest and confidence? Judith Bryant answered that dialogue also affects production. Dialogue helps children evaluate their work according to their own criteria, rather than by comparing themselves to others, which often makes them uncomfortable. Making children feel comfortable talking about art can help production as well as learning in the other disciplines.

The group concluded by addressing teachers' fears about the four disciplines. It was suggested that perhaps the disciplines should not be taught absolutely equally; instead, the teacher could be allowed to focus on his or her particular strength. Judith Bryant suggested letting the art work itself dictate the focus of inquiry—one work might lend itself to one discipline, while another might lend itself to a different focus.

GROUP C

GROUP LEADER

Renee Sandell

PARTICIPANTS

Gilbert Clark, Kristin G. Congdon, Lila Crespin, Michael D. Day, Leilani Lattin Duke, Ed Emshwiller, Sandra Gregor, Judith Koroscik, Elizabeth Kowalchuk, Denise Lauzier-Stone, Jane Maitland-Gholson, Jacques Maquet, Harold McWhinnie, Sally A. Myers, Jennifer Pazienza, Joan Peterson, Martin Rosenberg, Vicki Rosenberg, Robert Sitton, Robyn Turner, Barbara J. Weinstein

---

The group began its discussion by questioning the definitions of the disciplines and by debating their structure and content. They examined the teaching of art history in the context of traditional methods and limitations, particularly in terms of formalist versus interpretive inquiry. A number of questions were posed about the hierarchies of cognitive levels of development, including Bloom's taxonomy and its appropriateness for DBAE. The questions included the following:

In what logical sequence do we study aesthetics?

What is the aesthetic "attitude" of children at different grade levels?

Is DBAE too intellectual?

Is the purpose of DBAE to produce students capable of lifelong learning who are visually literate?

How do other cognitive approaches, such as storytelling (folklore), relate to the hierarchy of cognitive skills?

How can we avoid setting conventions, such as those suggested by Bloom, which demand that students conform and limit the range of their work?

The group confirmed the assertion of one of the morning's speakers that the thinking-feeling (co-affective) dichotomy is, in fact, closely related, especially in the arts. It was pointed out that heart and mind are combined in Broudy's *Enlightened Cherishing*.

The major challenge for DBAE proponents is to develop a pragmatic and realistic view of a number of problems, including: 1) scheduling of time for art in the classroom; 2) making suitable curricular materials more widely available; 3) influencing local, state, and federal education policies; and 4) educating parents and school administrators involved in the Effective School Movement and other reforms and issues.

Several participants strongly expressed the need for a greater emphasis on preservice and inservice training for both classroom and art teachers. Focusing on these target groups would require a restructuring of art education at the university and college level. It also would involve taking a careful look at the tacit knowledge of teachers and making efforts to empower teachers through the process of inquiry. Teachers of teachers

must recognize their responsibility as role models: teachers teach their students the way they were taught.

DBAE can encompass a breadth of approaches that encourage the creativity of educators as they strive to help teachers embrace problem-solving inquiry. The group urged realistic expectations in seeking long-term solutions.

GROUP D

GROUP LEADER

Larry A. Kantner

PARTICIPANTS

Kay Alexander, Jerilynn Changar, Faith Clover, Margaret DiBlasio, E. Barry Gaither, W. Dwaine Greer, John G. Hanhardt, Judith Koroscik, Kent Lydecker, Nancy MacGregor, Susan Mayer, Al Nickel, Michael Parsons, W. Jackson Rushing, Jeffery S. Seibert, Donald Soucy, Christine Thompson, Patricia Tinsman-Schaffer, Sydney Walker, Suzanne M. Wilson

---

This group's discussion ranged widely from the relations of cognitive theory and DBAE to questions about the role of art objects in the classroom. Dwaine Greer began by asking Judith Koroscik how she, as an art education scholar, relates what she is doing in the field of cognitive theory to DBAE. Koroscik replied that she is experimenting with how cognitive theory can be applied to curriculum. You cannot simply present students with facts and expect them to learn from that, she said. Rather, teachers should identify discipline concepts and structure the curriculum so that students can examine those concepts and have a chance to raise their own questions about works of art.

Koroscik suggested the use of comparative exemplars. Teachers should know why they introduce a certain work—what concepts of art criticism or history they want students to understand. In addressing the question of how color affects meaning, for

example, it might be useful to introduce a collection of works that serve as examples and counterexamples of that concept. The teacher thereby conveys the concept through critical inquiry, allowing students to see how different artists have approached similar problems but solved them differently. In this way, the teacher invites a dialogue with students, who ask why an artist chose to approach a problem in a particular way.

Greer, however, expressed concern that cognitive theorists are not referencing their theories to research in art education. It is as though cognitive science is over here while art education is over there—parallel but not connected. Where in art education does evidence already exist to support cognitive theory? Connections need to be found.

Greer also asked Koroscik about the distinction between experts and successful learners. Is a successful learner defined in terms of expertise? Koroscik replied that she was trying to sketch out a developmental continuum, from less successful learners to more successful learners, referring to the fact that people have very different levels of prior knowledge, which affect their understanding. Michael Parsons commented that Koroscik's contribution was to apply to art the concept of experts and novices—which is very common in other areas. That concept also lays out a continuum of subject matter, and subject matter affects the manner of learning. You cannot generalize in the abstract about cognitive learning, Parsons insisted. The expert/novice idea has to be particularized to art.

Parsons defined a successful learner as someone who is moving along the continuum toward expertise. You cannot simply make students behave as experts; they must progress toward it. How students attain expertise is a question of how you get them to move along the continuum.

In response to Greer's comment that the field needs to build on the references available in the literature and research on art education, Koroscik noted that the literature lacks explanation for certain fundamental problems, such as identifying the sources from which misconceptions about art arise. That research must be done before specific suggestions can be made about the kinds of learning activity in which students should engage. Greer agreed that an area for further research is the literature concerning the expert/novice dimension in cognitive science, much of which is devoted to determining how misconceptions arise. He cautioned, however, that researchers outside art education often discard appropriate alternative theories of aesthetics as misconceptions about art.

Concerning the value of art historical resources for children, Koroscik noted that teachers often present discrete bits of knowledge without attending to the larger frameworks of learning. Again, that amounts to asking children to behave like experts. More effective ways of presenting content material are needed. For example, you can consider how color affects meaning by structuring the questions differently to use historical as well as critical inquiry.

Barry Gaither raised the concern that the art object seemed to be marginalized in

many of the curriculum suggestions. The existence of objects is fundamental to the discussion of objects, and students need an engagement with artworks. The texture of a work is not something one can get from looking at a slide, but it has implications for meaning that need to be considered.

Gaither also felt that the role of museums was being marginalized. When discussion ensued about the lack of museum accessibility for all school populations, Gaither noted that there is an infinite number of artists whose works are not in museums but are accessible in every community. Does the lack of attention to these resources mean that only certain artists (those whose works are in museums) are useful for teaching art? If that is so, then only a certain body of art is relevant. Kent Lydecker agreed that the study of art encompasses more than just museum objects; it includes the student's entire visual environment. He urged that the subject matter be expanded to include objects that are not in the "sacred canon" of art.

These comments led to a spirited discussion of what constitutes an acceptable art object. Gaither felt that proscribing schools from using the works of certain artists because they have not been sanctioned represents too narrow a model. Greer observed that although DBAE does not recommend that any art object will do, it does not prescribe a certain set of "masterpieces." Students are supposed to learn to make qualitative judgments, to learn how to arrive at a set of definitions that will allow them to consider certain objects as masterpieces.

Gaither concluded with a caution of his own: DBAE does not intrinsically skewer values, but by expressing only one point of view and ignoring those outside the mainstream, it can allow itself to be viewed as an extension of the "Allan Bloom" definition of the American experience. He urged his colleagues to address possible misuses of the model. Greer noted that, in fact, people are using DBAE theory incorrectly, by attributing things to it that are not there and are not intended. Gaither added that he is concerned about some of the things that are not there; for example, discussion of each of the disciplines occurs from a certain point of view, and there is no requirement in DBAE that many points of view be brought forward. That, he felt, is dangerous. It is important to look at both the theory and the practice of DBAE to make sure that the proper objectives are being reached.

GROUP E

GROUP LEADER

Linda F. Ettinger

PARTICIPANTS

Patricia Amburgy, Diane Brigham, Carolyn Cochrane, Georgia Collins, Sally Hagaman, Laurie E. Hicks, Sharon Jacques, Andra N. Johnson, Jacques Maquet, William McCarter, Janis Norman, Sarah Otto-Diniz, Judith Perry, Ronald Reed, Becky Reese, Jon W. Sharer, Thomas J. Shuell, Marvin Spomer, Mary Stokrocki, Trudy Wilson, Anne G. Wolcott

---

This group was much more interested in raising and exploring questions than in finding answers. In order to generate questions, participants formed several smaller groups, each of which formulated a list of areas for research and study. Then the full group reconvened to combine and review the lists of questions.

Among the questions discussed were the following:

What are the multicultural differences in learning concepts and learning styles? DBAE is highly contextual and its proper application must be geared to the particular student population with which teachers are working. In addressing a multicultural population, for example, whose art history should be used, since content varies according to culture?

What can cognitive research contribute to our understanding of the teaching of aesthetics? Philosophical inquiry is closely allied with the development of students' reasoning skills, so cognitive research might suggest what children are able to do and when they are able to do it.

How does enculturation and change affect how people learn? If schools force students into a dualistic position, as one speaker suggested, how does this affect art education?

Are there gender differences in learning styles?

What does cognitive psychology contribute to the understanding of learning in art education? And what does it not tell us? Some questions, such as where meaning resides (with the object or with the viewer), seem to be philosophical in nature. How can psychology address such questions?

What are the assumptions that underlie cognitive psychology? Are there cultural overlays?

Where do we look for explications of learning, and what should be the sources of knowledge for thinking about DBAE content areas?

Do we look to developmental psychologists to explain learning in situations that might involve a certain amount of intervention?

Or do we look to sociologists, or philoso-

phers? What do people consider to be the sources for studio knowledge, for art criticism, and so on? The sources we use color our ideas and methods.

How will Belenky's and Perry's models affect the development of teacher education in DBAE? Specifically, rather than looking at the learning stages that women go through as a defective response, we should consider whether there are values in alternate styles of learning (competitive stances versus relationship-oriented responses, for instance). How might the models be modified to open up cognition and facilitate learning?

How can these models be used in teacher education, at the high school level?

What assumptions underlie the expert/novice model? How expert should teachers be? Are we overlooking some positive qualities of the novice? A larger question is the role of models in general: How do you decide which one is appropriate? How do different models interrelate?

How does one define a "fully educated adult?" How do the Perry levels address this question in terms of teacher training? How does the idea of male/female dualism come to bear? Can cognitive psychology address the question of a fully educated adult, or is that a philosophical question?

Many of these questions concern underlying assumptions. The group agreed that we must consult many sources in the development and implementation of cognitive approaches. We must question the theories of cognitive psychology before we accept them wholesale. However, cognitive psychology does have things to offer DBAE, and the group called for collaborative research in these areas. One suggestion was that graduate students in cognitive psychology team up with their counterparts in art education to conduct joint research on questions common to both fields.

Triangulation #3:
New Voices on Multicultural Concerns

SPEAKERS
Jacques Maquet
Anthropology Department, University of California, Los Angeles

Eldon Katter
Art Education Department, Kutztown University

E. Barry Gaither
Museum of the National Center for Afro-American Artists

Summary of Remarks by Jacques Maquet

Jacques Maquet contended that visual objects are unique, because they are among the few items that one can apprehend cross-culturally, at least in part, without translation. He defined visual objects as any artifacts whose main purpose is visual, including, but not limited to, works of art. One can approach them from three perspectives: the aesthetic, the symbolic, and the referential. Aesthetic and symbolic perspectives allow one to perceive the object directly; the referential perspective requires translation.

The lines, shapes, values, colors, and textures of any visual object are integrated into a whole (a formal composition), which can be directly perceived by the beholder, regardless of his or her particular culture. Preference for one style does not imply the aesthetic superiority of that style: apprehension of the quality of a configuration is not subjective preference, it is a matter of visually encountering the Gestalt-like dimension of the composition and analyzing the congruence of its forms. We should, thus, encourage and teach direct perception, which requires the viewer to suspend his or her usual flow of thoughts, feelings, and worries and just look. After this holistic perception, he or she is prepared to hear the art educator analyze the object's formal aspects.

The second perspective involves looking at the visual object as a symbolic sign. A sign is something that the viewer perceives as standing for something else in a particular context. The sign becomes a symbol when the relationship of signification is based on a common nature between the symbol and the symbolized. This relationship (red standing for warmth, fire, or blood, for example) means that the symbolic meanings do not have to be translated but can be perceived cross-culturally. Of course, symbols are polysemic—each has more than one natural connection—so different viewers from the same culture may perceive different meanings according to their own concerns.

But might not the concerns of some of those outside a culture be so different from those inside the culture that the range of symbolic meanings does not overlap? Maquet notes that many symbols spring from experiences common to all humans. Secondly, what may be more important than the overlap, is that visual symbols from one culture can also be meaningful for outsiders, though perhaps in a different way. There are two phases in apprehending the visual object as symbolic sign: a holistic, nondiscursive phase, in which one can perceive the symbolic meanings through atten-

Top: Jacques Maquet
Left: Eldon Katter
Right: E. Barry Gaither

tive looking; and an analytic phase, in which art educators and viewers discuss how the meanings are grounded in the object.

In approaching the visual object as referential sign, a contemplative phase is not needed, since the approach is cognitive and analytical. Art educators explain the relevant aspects of the culture from which the object comes: its use, the myths it expresses, and so on.

These three approaches demonstrate the privileged position that visual objects occupy in cross-cultural understanding. Like all objects, they carry cultural meanings that have to be translated, but, unlike other objects, they can also be apprehended directly. Viewers perceive the visual ordering of forms and symbolic meanings as they look at objects; this encounter does not require analysis, which comes later and cannot take the place of the immediate perception.

Maquet objected to the suggestion that the use of an integrated formal composition as a criterion of aesthetic excellence is a Western, classical construct that should not be applied to non-Western traditions (or even to some Western movements, such as abstract expressionism). He contended that there are only two relevant approaches for Western, "informalist" movements (a tiny minority of visual works): the symbolic and referential. Such works shift the concern from the search for aesthetic excellence to an exclusive concentration on powerful symbols.

Maquet concluded with a plea that educators allow time for "the contemplative mode of consciousness." Otherwise, the access to visual objects for cross-cultural understanding will be weakened.

Summary of Remarks by Eldon Katter

Although there are a number of programs aimed at highlighting cultural diversity, there is confusion about how curricular reform should reflect that diversity. This is particularly true, Eldon Katter noted, within art education. G.C. Baker states that multicultural education offers every student the opportunity to support and maintain one or more cultures. That also means that each student has a responsibility to contribute to the common culture. Two issues, then, emerge from this definition: cultural diversity and common culture.

If the maintenance of the common culture depends on the student's being versed in a common body of knowledge, then art education must identify certain works of art or concepts with which every American should be familiar. If exposure to diversity requires encounters with objects and concepts from a variety of cultures, then art education should ensure that the concepts and works with which Americans are familiar are not limited to European traditions. People schooled in Western art, as most of us are, do not think of their way of seeing as culturally imposed but as *the* way of seeing. The question then is: What counts as appropriate art content for a culturally diverse society? The answer depends on how one views the art experience.

Jacques Maquet has examined the structure of the art experience and has distinguished the universal, cultural, and individual dimensions of each component. He identifies the following four components as interactive: the art object, the maker, the perceiver, and the context. The art object can be placed at the center of a continuum of experience. The maker operates between idea generation and technical production; the perceiver operates between preference and judgment. These activities take place within cultural and temporal contexts; likewise, the disciplines also operate within this framework. Idea generation and technical production are the focus of art production; subjective and objective response, standards of excellence, and interpretation of meaning are considerations in art criticism. Cultural and temporal concerns are references in art history and the sociology of art. Katter suggests that since there is debate about where discipline boundaries should be drawn, perhaps the multicultural study of art should be considered holistically, focusing on the art experience, as in Maquet's work.

One answer to the question What counts as art content? is that works of art count. Are some works too insignificant to be of value for study? That depends on how one views the study of art. If our perspective is global, the answer is a conditional no. The condition is that we consider Maquet's universal, cultural, and individual dimensions of the art experience. The universal dimension represents human elements, which are metacultural and based on commonalities. Expressions of human themes, such as joy, suffering, death, and friendship, are common to the human condition and can be appreciated by people in diverse societies. Maquet also believes that sensory and formal elements can be appreciated cross-

culturally. The full meaning of symbols cannot always be decoded, but formal order often can be viewed universally.

Maquet divides the cultural dimension into three categories: the productive, the societal, and the ideational. Studying art objects as ideational constructs involves looking at them as products of formal systems of mental activities, such as theologies and philosophies. Presented in this way, art objects can be understood by students in terms of how they function within a culture. The societal configuration involves seeing objects as products influenced by institutionalized networks of relationships. Students can examine how internal and external institutions and societal networks (museums, for example, or political patronage) affect the creation of objects. Maquet's third category, the productive, involves seeing objects as the results of production. Students can consider how objects might be influenced by the process of production, including the materials and technology available within a culture.

Maquet treats the individual as the nucleus of the art experience. In multicultural classrooms, it is important for students to understand that often it is individual activity (or a group behaving as an individual) that breaks boundaries and sparks innovation.

By interposing the framework for the art experience with Maquet's distinctions, one can identify certain concepts for art instruction. In regard to the art object, universal, cultural, and individual considerations can be addressed. For example, universal considerations could identify the noninstrumental elements that appear in objects from almost every society; cultural considerations could address how the function of objects changes from one era or civilization to the next; and individual considerations could examine how objects accommodate several meanings for personal interpretation. The same is true for the maker, the perceiver, the context of time, and the context of place. Art educators also should consider cultural variables in the art experience. By making universal, cultural, and individual distinctions, art teachers can address the study of multicultural art objects. As Katter noted, it is impossible to teach about all art or all cultures; choices must be made. He advocates the adaptation of Maquet's ideas as the core content for preservice training to help teachers make those choices in an informed manner.

Summary of Remarks by E. Barry Gaither
Barry Gaither began his presentation by likening America to a "brunswick stew in which one can still find the peppers, the onions, and the beef." We are all contributors to the stew, but we are not all equally appreciated. America has been dominated by the traditions of Europe, and non-European traditions have been marginalized. The works of some black artists, for example, have been devalued because of the narrow cultural assumptions that have held sway in our educational and cultural matrix.

America's early cultural models were European, familiar to European immigrants. To native Americans, blacks, and other non-Europeans, however, these models are foreign and inaccessible. Non-European models have been devalued, but, Gaither contended, it is precisely these non-Europeans who give America its cultural freshness. These people are our greatest resource.

Gaither presented a model for considering cultural questions that he believes avoids some of the problems noted above. He thinks of art objects as having two parts: specific form, or the observable traits that can be quantified; and a complex of meanings, or the elements that inform the object's production and determine its significance.

We could think of the specific form of a visual art object, "the container," as being the physical expression of the art. We can talk about size, shape, texture, color, etc. We can also talk about the object's relationship to similar objects. The fact that the object is the personal creation of the artist does not, however, convey any meaning to the object other than that of self-realization. Culture must endow the object with meaning.

In discussing the complex of meanings, Gaither suggested thinking of the category as divided into three pie-shaped parts, which have no fixed proportions. He calls the three parts: the socio-political matrix, artistic traditions, and the self of the artist. By investigating the interplay of these elements, we can move toward formulating cultural assumptions that are free of cultural and racial prejudices.

Gaither defined the socio-political matrix as the sum of temporal and spatial elements that contain and particularize experiences. Within this matrix are all our shared exchanges: our place in history, our symbolic legacies, our overlapping histories. The matrix is also a place where the struggle for power is unending and where people strive for hegemony over themselves and others. Within the matrix are schools, universities, and museums—institutions whose mission is to move society toward its best vision of itself. The matrix also contains definitions by which cultural acts and objects acquire meaning. The matrix is, said Gaither, the source of the raw materials outside ourselves from which art and culture are made.

In order to speak of our experiences using this matrix, we must remember that we live in a post-colonial, post-slavery era, and attitudes from these earlier eras intrude on us today. It is impossible to be born black, socialized in the United States, and not be

aware of race, said Gaither. Black people in this country share certain experiences with others in the "third world." Self-determination and hegemony over one's life are strongly felt imperatives in the black world.

How do black museums fit into the matrix? Gaither argues that they must participate in the rebuilding of black social wholeness by helping to reestablish the integrity of the black heritage. They must assert that heritage in ways that are valid to African-Americans and that demand respect. Black museums must foster a sense of inclusiveness within the black community. They must have a clear perspective on their role within the larger museum field, and they must become voices for the actual and symbolic heritage of blacks. Black museums must establish an authentic place for the black experience in this country; it is a role only they can fulfill.

Gaither noted that the creation of a particular work takes place within the context of technical and aesthetic traditions, whose canons govern the modes of presentation. This does not limit how an artist may change or expand the scope of these prior traditions; rather, prior traditions are a backdrop against which one can easily recognize new growth.

A complex of elements bears on the appreciation of art: *style*, traits that give unity to communities of objects; *beauty*, the properties that mark superior solutions to formal problems; *significance*, the perception of the importance of certain works; *creative force*, the endowing of objects with the ability to stir passion; and *integrity*, the way an object derives authenticity from its relationship to the shared identity of a cultural family.

Among the implications for black artists is the conflict between absolutist aesthetic ideals and comparative aesthetic positions. European economic, political, and technical domination, along with cultural hegemony, have set forth the idea that European art is universal. Gaither points out that art is fundamentally culture-specific. Cultures generate aesthetic ideals according to their own history and beliefs. Cultures are validated by the authentic experience of a people as they understand it. According to Gaither, no culture requires sanction from another; but through self-knowledge a culture is able to incorporate new ideas on its own terms.

What are the implications for black museums with respect to art historical traditions? Black museums must advance the understanding of the black artistic heritage, avoiding formulations that describe black heritage as one-dimensional. They must encourage scholarly (art historical) criticism of that heritage and the careful study of the objects themselves. They must also clarify the aesthetic assumptions that inform this heritage.

The last category is the self. The self is unique, said Gaither. It can speak only from its own perspective. Experience gives the artist something to say; the artist must lay open the inner struggles that accompany his or her encounter with the self. This is the ultimate commitment to self-possession, and self-possession is necessary for rebirth after colonialism and slavery.

The most radical act that a "third world" person can commit in this country is to become one's self. Black museums must affirm the existential freedom of black artists, giving them the space they need to exist. The galleries of black museums must be forums where black artists, their art, and the public come together.

Gaither closed by saying that he believed the imperative of our time is to create a model that can offer a bias-free understanding of all the peoples who make up America. America's heterogeneity has always been its strength; we should try to strengthen all the "flavors" in the brunswick stew.

Friday Afternoon Breakout Sessions: New Voices on Multicultural Concerns

GROUP A

GROUP LEADER

Enid Zimmerman

PARTICIPANTS

Terry Barrett, Donna Kay Beattie, Margaret Burchenal, John S. Crawford, Sandra Epps, Susan R. Euler, Dennis Fehr, John G. Hanhardt, Eldon Katter, Michael Kendall, Beverly W. Krieger, Richard LaTour, Stanley S. Madeja, Connie Newton, Michael E. Ott, Robert L. Russell, Maurice Sevigny, Mary Ann Stankiewicz, Frances Thurber, Philip Yenawine

---

This group wrestled with two major issues: how to define multicultural education and how to implement a multicultural art education curriculum in such a way as to socialize and empower students.

The group questioned any definition of multicultural that is not all-inclusive. "We are ethnocentric if we exclude any group," Michael Kendall stressed. As a corollary, the group asserted the importance of recognizing the diversity of each group of students with respect to class, race, and gender.

The group next turned to the topic of the limited resources, including time, that are available to "make everybody count." A number of participants noted that they are uncomfortable with the idea of teaching cultures with which they are themselves unfamiliar; they questioned how many cultures one must include to make a program qualify as multicultural. Connie Newton asserted that the point is "not to add multicultural to education but to make education multicultural." Enid Zimmerman pointed out that this concern falls within the broader issue of equity in the classroom and leads to such practical questions as curriculum content and teaching methodology.

In considering the pragmatics of finding and making use of resources, the group noted the following possible resources: students, parents, other teachers, and individuals in the community, especially artists. Richard LaTour pointed out that teachers often overlook social studies textbooks as resources for multicultural art images; this statement led to a discussion of integrating the arts curriculum into other subject areas. It was suggested that, ideally, there should be collaboration between teachers of different subjects and grades to develop sequential, relevant multicultural programs. Donna Kay Beattie reported that the Netherlands structures multicultural curriculum content according to themes that apply to all cultures. The group agreed that it was not a question of deciding what cultures to include in the curriculum content as much as one of determining a process, or methodology, of teaching that will help students understand themselves, their own cultures, other people, and other cultures. This should be done through examples of art that are, according to Michael Ott, "democratic and non-exclusionary." Kendall stated that the "best examples stem from a commonsense approach that starts with a mindset that the concept of minority/majority is not valid anymore."

The group next discussed the challenge of altering the attitudes of teachers, stu-

dents, parents, and communities. LaTour referred to a theory of educational change that describes three possible types of action: technical changes in curriculum; legislative change by political mandate; and cultural change, which requires a long-term commitment to changing attitudes. It was agreed that ideally there would be action on all three levels. Participants also discussed specific ways to promote humanistic changes in the attitudes of preservice and inservice teachers, attitudinal changes that would discourage teachers from adhering to an ethnocentric or monocultural viewpoint. Maurice Sevigny observed that cultural connections become more apparent and more vital for teachers through travel. Others suggested bringing into the classroom individuals, especially artists, from different cultural groups in the community as well as from other countries. Although everyone agreed on the value of having artists come into the classroom, there was some disagreement among the group about whether or not teachers would be open to this practice.

Zimmerman next asked the group to discuss problems caused by the lack of a DBAE multicultural model. Sevigny observed that too many fail to see the relevance of either DBAE or multiculturalism. Other participants voiced a concern that in the DBAE construct, the disciplines have tended to be one-dimensional rather than multicultural. Kendall felt that DBAE has the potential to provide curriculum models that include multiculturalism. However, Hanhardt maintains that the place of art history in DBAE is not automatically sufficient if an artwork is presented as "a precious object without a dynamic relationship to human experience." He stressed that "the ultimate point is to relate things to human experience, which is the common denominator across cultures."

Both DBAE and multicultural education require major changes in the current system and share a significant common purpose; therefore, it was suggested that the Getty Center increase its efforts to combine and promote both agendas. These efforts would be aided by social realities, such as changing demographics and racial disharmony, which are forcing educational systems to come to grips with multicultural issues.

The group concluded with a discussion of the common theme of transmitting humanistic values. As John Hanhardt put it, "The whole point of the public plan for education is that education presumably moves us to a more harmonious, coherent, affirming social order." Art teachers and the teachers of art teachers, therefore, have an enormous responsibility to promote an understanding of the art of a variety of cultures in such a way as to socialize and empower students.

GROUP B

GROUP LEADER

Amy Brook Snider

PARTICIPANTS

Judith Madden Bryant, Nancy Berry, Ann Calvert, John C. Chamberlin, Gilbert Clark, Mary Erickson, Hermine Feinstein, Paulette S. Fleming, Lynn Galbraith, George Geahigan, Glenda Gentry, Sharon R. Gray, Eldon Katter, Martin P. Rayala, Mindy J. Richman, Jeanne Rollins, J. Russell Sale, Ralph A. Smith

---

The group began by focusing on the challenge to establish a theoretical construct for choosing art exemplars for use within the limited time available in most schools. It was suggested that the three complementary perspectives described by Maquet—aesthetic, symbolic, and cultural—be used as guidelines for choosing appropriate works.

Gilbert Clark questioned the assumption that DBAE includes only Western and classical works, pointing out that fifty percent of the works used in DBAE workshops are non-Western. Paulette Fleming suggested that an incorrect impression may have been given by early DBAE publications, which represented only Western art.

A lively exchange followed regarding the language used in classroom discussions of art. Some participants asserted that students misunderstand and misuse formal language, while others thought that students tend to discuss formal concerns to the exclusion of interpretation and a consideration of meanings. Judith Bryant stressed that in teaching visual literacy it is important to remember that "all language is culturally bound." George Geahigan noted his success in restructuring art appreciation courses by starting with the functions of artworks rather than formalistic principles.

Amy Snider raised the issue of what it means to be part of a minority in a majority culture; she advocated the application of real-life experiences in any consideration of multicultural issues. Bryant elaborated this point; she reported that research indicates that different cultures "see" art in very different ways. Consequently, it is imperative that ways be found to sensitize teachers to different aesthetics within which the arts of other cultures function—to "get teachers to see how other people think and relate to their world."

Clark pointed out that it is unreasonable to expect a teacher to be fully able to convey the roots of cultural perception for twenty-five or more cultures; therefore, a new definition of multicultural education is needed. One suggestion was that examples used in the classroom should reflect the make-up of that particular class, the school, and its community. Teachers have a responsibility to educate themselves about the cultures of their area. However, when using local cultures as examples, it is important to avoid treating non-Western culture as exotic. According to Bryant, "we need to face up to the historical neglect" of non-Western art and bring all cultures into the mainstream.

The group also discussed whether the

goals of DBAE are compatible with the goals of multicultural education. The general consensus was that there is no major conflict between the two agendas, although DBAE focuses on content and is not specifically geared to the development of a student's self-esteem, which is one of the goals of multicultural education. It was noted, however, that while using the content-specific curriculum of DBAE, a teacher has the opportunity to attend to the humanistic concerns of multicultural education. Erickson asserted that DBAE is "not just a body of knowledge but an inquiry process we can teach...[to] provide a framework."

Several participants felt that what is more important than which art exemplars are used in the classroom, is the willingness and ability of a teacher to help students look at their own and each other's cultures and give them the resource tools with which to transfer that understanding to new cultures they encounter. Ann Calvert expressed a concern about how teachers put ideas into practice: "people will use the ideas about which they know the most and those which are most accessible."

The group agreed that art is a powerful tool for uncovering cultural assumptions and biases held by students. Teachers must be sensitive to this and work to clarify the misconceptions of students. They need to draw a distinction between subjective responses to works and critical analyses of art.

Snider concluded the session by describing an exercise she uses: students from different cultural backgrounds visit a museum together and must explain and defend why they like the art they do. In the process, they come to understand that "their choices come from a cultural framework."

GROUP C

GROUP LEADER

Renee Sandell

PARTICIPANTS

Kristin G. Congdon, Lila Crespin, Michael D. Day, Stephen Dobbs, Ed Emshwiller, Elizabeth Kowalchuk, Denise Lauzier-Stone, Jane Maitland-Gholson, Jacques Maquet, Harold McWhinnie, Sally A. Myers, Jennifer Pazienza, Joan Peterson, Martin P. Rayala, Vicki Rosenberg, Robert Sitton, Robyn Turner, Barbara J. Weinstein

---

Two basic questions were posed at the beginning of this discussion: What is culture? and Whose culture is it? Vicki Rosenberg suggested that Eldon Katter's application of Jacques Maquet's theory regarding the universal, cultural, and individual elements of art might offer a basis for curriculum reform. Maquet agreed that the issue of the study and use of non-Western art objects should not be an either/or situation; by considering formal issues, it is possible to analyze non-Western objects in a manner similar to that used for Western artworks. Maquet also stressed the value of "having an experience with the object that is not immediately discursive." He drew an analogy with meditation techniques and the martial arts.

After a brief discussion of the practical implications of evaluating aesthetic appreciation and the role of evaluation in a curriculum, Renee Sandell steered the group back to the "global problem of recognition and concern for ethnic diversity." In response, Jennifer Pazienza questioned the appropriateness of using traditional Western methods of art historical inquiry to analyze art from other cultures.

Robert Sitton emphasized the "need to look at the deep structure of thinking in other cultures as well as the nature of their art" and asserted that we need to recognize "the semiotic baggage that we bring to aesthetics." Sitton also suggested another approach to the problem of addressing cultural diversity in curricula: "The question is not so much what we can do for the minority culture within our purview, but what they can do to reorder our methodology."

In response to the charges that DBAE is based on a masculine interpretation of art education and that DBAE does not interface with a variety of cultural perspectives, Day answered that curriculum writers can derive content from any cultural perspective. DBAE only requires that the curriculum include resources from the four disciplines. According to Day, "The cultural aspect can be accommodated by going to the appropriate source."

Other issues raised in exploring the power relationship between dominant and minority cultures included the fact that multicultural education is usually discussed in terms of the dominant culture; that the definitions of what constitutes art are usually predicated on the definitions of the dominant culture; that minority cultures should be allowed to speak in their own voices; that we need to recognize "hidden streams" and "upstream" as well as "mainstream" art; and that minority cultures offer alterna-

tive views and provide a critique of the dominant culture.

Shifting the focus of the conversation, Jane Maitland-Gholson pointed out that a discussion of the underlying patriarchal structure of Western thought could go on forever. She also suggested that educators should address ethnic groups in terms of the American version of their cultures; the needs of African-American students are not necessarily met through the study of African masks. Teachers must learn how to draw out and make use of children's tacit understanding of the cultures and subcultures of their communities, schools, and classrooms.

It was suggested that identifying universal themes within cultures was a way to place the arts in a broader context for study. Joan Peterson offered the example of history and social science classes in California, which are organized by theme according to age group. Ed Emshwiller reported that at CalArts, where intercultural awareness is a priority, visiting artists are brought in to share their diverse cultural viewpoints.

Robyn Turner raised the issue of how DBAE addresses different socio-economic groups, ages, and religions and whether these categories fall under the umbrella of multicultural. Day responded by repeating his assertion that DBAE can accommodate any number of topics and points of view, and that it is the responsibility of those writing curricula to include diverse cultures. Maitland-Gholson, reminding the group that curricula need not be imposed from above, cited the work of a graduate student who is holding town meetings to develop an arts curriculum for a school.

Rosenberg closed the discussion with the observation that within DBAE's development "the aesthetic orientation did seem to structure the context" to the exclusion of political and social concerns. In her view, however, DBAE is not a restrictive construct, rather, it is flexible enough to address these issues.

GROUP D

GROUP LEADER

Larry A. Kantner

PARTICIPANTS

Kay Alexander, Jerilynn Changar, Faith Clover, E. Barry Gaither, W. Dwaine Greer, Judith Koroscik, Kent Lydecker, Nancy MacGregor, Susan Mayer, Michael Parsons, W. Jackson Rushing, Jeffery S. Seibert, Donald Soucy, Christine Thompson, Patricia Tinsman-Schaffer, Sydney Walker

---

The group focused primarily on the nature and role of multicultural education in DBAE. An important subtopic was the issue of relevant research.

The problem of multicultural resource materials was discussed from several angles. Barry Gaither suggested that there are numerous existing sources for materials, such as discipline specialists and practicing artists. However, he noted, teachers often prefer to continue what they have been teaching and do not agressively seek new resources. An important way to broaden their practices would be to provide a resource guide of the existing material. That might include catalogue introductions, short articles, an annotated bibliography, and names and addresses of resource persons. Such a guide would ideally represent a large database of information on the various cultures within America. Jackson Rushing noted that in the past, efforts to create public awareness of particular cultures have often been based on the political expediency of the time.

Kay Alexander worried about the authenticity of cultural materials, given the current rush to provide these materials for teachers. The group also expressed concern about how to help teachers find a valid starting point for using materials and how to prevent misinterpretation. The topic of superficial treatment of the arts of other cultures was extended to include a lengthy discussion of the problematic role that language plays in influencing cultural understanding.

Rushing suggested that people from the specific cultures involved should be brought into the process of preparing "bias-free" resource materials. Gaither noted that within some cultural traditions not every person is perceived as a valid spokesperson. He suggested that an attempt should be made to identify who or what represents "the best self" of particular ethnic or cultural groups. Jerilynn Changar warned against relying too heavily on the advice of experts for the authentication of materials, since experts do not always agree. She also commented that teachers should collaborate with experts on creating materials, since experts are not always trained to translate cultural materials for teachers and students. Dwaine Greer pointed out that sometimes the cultural groups themselves have not reached agreement about how they want their culture represented or how they want their children educated. Larry Kantner cautioned against becoming so "locked into history" that we ignore the contemporary art of different cultures and concentrate solely on traditional works.

In a discussion of whether artworks should be presented as purely aesthetic objects, Kent Lydecker advocated emphasizing formal properties, since "the best success often occurs when you depoliticize the process of ethnicity and deal with issues inherent in the art itself." However, he also suggested that ethnicity is a powerful educational tool because it empowers people to believe in themselves. It can thus be used as a strategy to begin the education process and to establish meaningful communication with audiences. Gaither replied that when ethnicity raises uncomfortable issues, it can be both an affirming and a stressful experience. He suggested that this could be an integral part of an educational model. He would support the study of art within its historical context and recommended that educators resist the "temptation to separate life from art," since objects derive their value from the ways in which they belong to human experience.

Alexander suggested using a thematic approach (celebrations, for example) as an organizing principle for introducing the art of other cultures. The group also talked about the need to identify the primary goals of multicultural art education within the context of general educational goals. Some expressed concern that xenophobia might be a widespread problem.

The group identified the following areas for research consideration:

1) alternative ways of looking at the art object—the formalistic or purely aesthetic curriculum approach versus a contextual approach;

2) how different ethnic groups want their cultures presented;

3) case studies of exemplary teaching of DBAE, with special consideration given to multicultural concerns;

4) how other cultures represent such issues as gender, ecology, and technology, and what this might tell us about ourselves and others;

5) situations, such as multilingual schools and classrooms, that might add a richness to DBAE.

GROUP E

GROUP LEADER

Linda F. Ettinger

PARTICIPANTS

Patricia Amburgy, Diane Brigham, Carolyn Cochrane, Georgia Collins, Sally Hagaman, Laurie E. Hicks, Andra N. Johnson, William McCarter, Janis Norman, Sarah Otto-Diniz, Judith Perry, Ronald Reed, Jon W. Sharer, Thomas J. Shuell, Marvin Spomer, Mary Stokrocki, Trudy Wilson, Anne G. Wolcott

---

While some in this group have been seeking to establish the best curriculum, others have taken a more relativistic or interpretive stance. One of the first things the group addressed was the problematic nature of language. Although we may use the same words, we cannot assume that we all mean the same thing—particularly in multicultural situations. In considering questions about ethnic and cultural diversity, for example, are the two equated or is there a difference between "ethnic" and "cultural?" Laurie Hicks's statement that cultural diversity seems to include a larger population divided into many subgroups led to a number of questions: How far do we extend the idea of culture? Are there children's cultures, women's cultures, geographic cultures? The field needs to consider what constitutes a culture, since curriculum selections are based on that definition.

Another important question was: What models of art criticism do other cultures use that may depart totally from the Western analytical approach? "Can you take a multicultural perspective on art criticism?" Georgia Collins inquired. She observed that Western art criticism always seems to end in a judgment, and we do not know enough about other cultures to know if that applies. Janis Norman noted that there has to be an interpretation based on how a particular object functions in the culture from which it comes. The object should be perceived as successful if it fulfills its function; masks used in ritual dances by the Indians of the Pacific Northwest are an example of this kind of success. "Still," said Norman, "the object will have elements of form and line and color, so you can begin to make the student visually aware of his or her perceptions, while realizing that it may not be appropriate to judge the object in a Western way."

Laurie Hicks cautioned that approaching an object in the traditional Western way implicitly tells students that this is a legitimate way to analyze a non-Western object. We need to make it clear that a Western construct is being placed on a non-Western object, and that the object is being analyzed out of context. She feels that that is a problematic view to present to students.

The context of art criticism is closely bound to its practice and should be opened up, several participants suggested. Critical theory can provide potential sources for inquiry; feminist theory, for example, provides a model for developing other approaches to viewing, discussing, and defining art that moves outside the traditional Western construct. Changes may need to be made in basic assumptions about the struc-

ture of the educational system. Linda Ettinger wondered if multicultural inquiry can exist in a system that depends on norm-referenced criteria.

The discussion next focused on how to empower children to talk about and value their cultures. One suggestion was to encourage them to choose some of the images they want to examine. Some group members felt, however, that children might not be prepared to make those kinds of decisions; they worried about the dangers of letting children choose the content of the curriculum.

The group saw interdisciplinary approaches as holding great potential. Judith Norman commented that we inundate children with too much cognitive information without teaching them critical thinking. Interdisciplinary experiences would help them to think in an interrelated way and to process their knowledge more effectively. Such an approach also would help solve the problem of limited resources for the art teacher. Diane Brigham suggested that museums might provide a useful resource for integrated fields of study. Typically, children come to museums as part of their social studies classes; there is a "magical moment of intersection" that can occur if the classroom or social studies teacher and the art teacher coordinate their curricula. Not only should the art teacher address Indian art because the children are studying India, but the classroom teacher should also provide knowledge about India that relates to the Indian art objects the children will view at the museum. William McCarter commented that the classroom teacher has many more opportunities for that kind of coalescing than the art teacher, who is limited by time. He suggested enlisting the classroom teacher as a major ally in multicultural studies. One social studies text, he said, was found to contain more than 600 works of arts—a fact of which the art specialist was not aware. We need to be aware and take advantage of these opportunities.

The role of museums in multicultural studies is problematic in one regard: currently, museums are categorized as history, anthropology, or art museums. Many non-Western, non-white art objects are housed in institutions other than art museums; we need to consider what this implies and how we can make use of these alternative resources.

The group raised the question whether the same emphasis on multiculturalism should be brought to bear on each of the disciplines. How can studio activities address multiculturalism? Given the Western tradition of emulating stylistic characteristics, does the making of a kachina doll, for instance, result in any cultural understanding? This question addressed a larger issue about the problems of integrating the four disciplines. For example, what relevance does the study of German expressionism have for studio production?

Overall, this discussion demonstrated that there is no single voice in the field about multicultural concerns or, indeed, other aspects of DBAE. Group members raised many questions and felt keenly the

need for more research in the area of multiculturalism, which would perhaps provide a variety of approaches to the issue within the curriculum.

Triangulation #4:
New Voices on Growing up with Philosophy and Aesthetics

SPEAKERS

Philip Yenawine
Department of Education, Museum of Modern Art, New York

Marilyn Stewart
Department of Art Education, Kutztown University

Ronald Reed
Analytic Teaching Center, Texas Wesleyan University

Top: Marilyn Stewart
Left: Ronald Reed
Right: Philip Yenawine

Summary of Remarks by Philip Yenawine

Philip Yenawine based his remarks on his observations of a variety of workshops for teachers that have been presented by the education staff of the Museum of Modern Art; he particularly focused on a workshop on aesthetics. Like many other programs for teachers, this one addressed the essential question of twentieth-century aesthetics: What is art? Any consideration of art in the twentieth century must deal with the diminishing role of the object and the growing centrality of ideas. This presents problems for teachers; indeed, people often respond with hostility to an emphasis on the conceptual aspect of art. But that very hostility raises the essential question and can initiate an aesthetic dialogue. In order to carry on such a dialogue, it is necessary to have an understanding of the traditional forms and reasons for departing from tradition, along with a critical vocabulary.

The traditional role of art is functional, integral, and essential: it has served as a means of expressing cultural myths through symbols and iconography that were universally recognized within the culture. Today, the art that museums of contemporary art collect and exhibit is representative of a culture that is different from its predecessors. Because it reflects the global village in which we live, it lacks coherence. Yet it strives for a universal language that can transcend time and place. Moreover, the importance of self-expression has led to a change in attitude towards craftsmanship, which no longer serves as a strict measure of success. Finally, as a largely literate society, we no longer depend on art to inform and educate.

These are some of the reasons why today's art looks different; they are also some of the reasons for its marginalization. But, as Yenawine pointed out, although television and other media have assumed some of art's roles, they lack its complexity and richness of meanings.

Discussing some of these issues can help teachers confront their frustration when dealing with contemporary art. However, we must also address their lack of vocabulary, which is the main reason that teachers and others need help in approaching aesthetics and aesthetic discourse. Yenawine advocates methods that focus on observation and analysis, a kind of pulling apart of the looking process, to examine physical and illusionary properties, formal elements, subject matter, and the relationship of the viewer to the artwork.

Yenawine gave examples in each area. The ability to identify physical properties could be taught by examining an assemblage such as Robert Rauschenberg's *First*

Landing Jump, which includes a rubber tire, an old lighting fixture, license plates, and other similar objects. Observing how they are put together leads one to consider our disposable culture and its irreverence for tradition, which Rauschenberg draws upon for meaning. Each area has an observational entry point (or points) that is tied to the others, and through analysis of the interaction between them, we can form a critical methodology.

Yenawine has found that teachers using this deliberate way of looking seem to develop the skills to begin the aesthetic discussion. Once they have mastered the verbal component, several strategies can be used to introduce them to the topic of aesthetics. To help them understand how art functions, for example, it is helpful to ask them to describe various uses of art in popular culture, as well as how artists use images from popular culture in their works. Another strategy is to present teachers with unattributed statements by artists and ask them to find works that relate to the statements. It does not matter if the teacher finds the "right" artist; what matters is the discussion of intention, or the artist's success in *communicating* his or her intention, as a way to address the issue of assessing quality. An aesthetic dialogue can be triggered by a question as simple as, What do you think about this? One of Yenawine's favorite questions is, What's wrong with this picture? because the response challenges assumptions of right and wrong.

If we must provide people with a definition of art because they will not or cannot arrive at one themselves, one possibility is: "Art is what the art world has decided to embrace as art. . . . so we can just accept their judgment and turn our attention to what's in it for us." Although this is not a satisfying definition, it is guaranteed to stimulate a strong reaction. Another, more abstract definition is: "Art is something that makes you think and feel at the same moment, reveals something you did not know, or taps into something you knew, but didn't know you knew."

One of Yenawine's observations is that philosophical inquiries should come at the appropriate times in the lives of those we teach. He believes that reflective discussions about works of art are less productive with younger children than with adolescents and adults. To suggest that young children should deal with the ideas and intentions of artists and the definitions of art implies the existence of boundaries that, Yenawine feels, are not naturally assumed by children.

Summary of Remarks by Marilyn Stewart

Marilyn Stewart referred to aesthetics as "the troubled adolescent," because it avoids formulation into concepts, skills and attitudes that can be sequenced in the DBAE curriculum. In discussing the concerns of aesthetics as a discipline, Stewart first looked at it as a branch of philosophy. Philosophers create frameworks for making sense of the world; they do this by considering "big pictures" and smaller pieces of reality. Aestheticians provide frameworks for examining and understanding the experience of beauty and art, the nature and significance of art, as well as the meaning and value of art. They use the same methods as philosophers—that is, the method of inquiry. Philosophy as a whole is characterized by dialogue, which operates according to rules of language and logic. Entry into the dialogue constitutes an agreement to be persuaded by reason.

Stewart next considered the value of philosophical inquiry for children. Children need a way to organize their art experiences, and philosophical inquiry provides that means. It also encourages children to listen to and consider the ideas of others, and to examine and clarify their own beliefs and assumptions. Not only is this important in terms of the art experience, but it is also important for autonomous growth.

In teaching aesthetics, one must decide how much assistance is necessary to help the child organize his or her experience. The curriculum should provide some structure, but it should also grant students the right to question categories and distinctions. Aesthetics must be interwoven with the other disciplines: aesthetic inquiry is meaningful only if children are involved in art historical, critical, and studio-based inquiry.

Asking what the subject matter for aesthetics should be is, in effect, asking what students should know in order to claim that they know aesthetics. Generally, Stewart said, they should know that complicated questions about art, beauty, aesthetic experience, and art criticism exist; that, used carefully, words can help them think, talk, and write about these questions; that reasons offered to support positions help them and others to examine beliefs; that philosophers have attempted to answer these questions; that not all philosophers agree; and that philosophers have used reasons to discuss these questions.

In terms of philosophical inquiry, Stewart provided another checklist of what children should know: how to listen to the points of view of others; how to make general statements about beauty, art, aesthetic experience, and art criticism; how to evaluate the use of statements and definitions; how to present reasons in support of positions; how to raise questions; and how to use these skills to engage in philosophical inquiry. If students know how to do these things, they should be able to inquire about beauty, art, aesthetic experience, and art criticism, and to look for and respect alternative views.

As for strategies for teaching aesthetics, Stewart notes that teaching sometimes involves telling, so that in the early grades emphasis might be placed on categories

drawn from distinctions made by philosophers, while the names and ideas of particular philosophers might be given in the later grades. The names and categories are not as important as the way they are presented. Students should be encouraged to think for themselves; the most important teaching strategy involves reacting positively to inquiry, encouraging questions when they arise rather than dismissing them. Discussion can be a planned activity or a spontaneous one.

Although people usually perceive philosophy to be difficult and many, including teachers, suffer from "philosophy-phobia," Stewart believes it is possible to prepare teachers to be qualified and feel comfortable teaching aesthetics. Teachers should be able to recognize a philosophical issue, formulate questions to address it, and use the skills of good reasoning. They should, furthermore, have knowledge of the issues and positions found in the literature of aesthetics in order to present students with the ideas considered by philosophers. This would allow them to pursue questions along with their students.

Philosophy-phobia hampers inservice education. Teachers often think that a dichotomy exists between cognition and emotion and that art is only concerned with feeling. Sometimes they misconceive philosophical inquiry. They must be helped to understand that, while inquiry may not lead to a "right" answer, opinions can be thoughtfully held, and closure may consist of the agreement to disagree. Preservice education programs can provide prospective teachers with experience in inquiry, along with coursework in aesthetics and opportunities to practice the teaching of aesthetics. When teachers learn that there is a way to address the questions that they and their students have about art, they develop a sense of power in their abilities to help children reflect upon and understand their experiences with art.

Summary of Remarks by Ronald Reed

Ronald Reed believes that "philosophy for children" offers a number of opportunities for art educators, especially in stimulating critical dialogue. Philosophy for children began in 1969 when Matthew Lipman, a professor of philosophy at Columbia University, confronted two problems: first, children did not think as well as they could or should; and, second, while young children seemed to enjoy inquiry, their innate curiosity diminished as they progressed through school. Lipman decided to approach these problems through philosophy because he felt there was a similarity between the activity of philosophers and the "why questions" that children like to raise. Also, philosophy concentrates on raising procedural issues that, while common to other disciplines, often get lost in the drive for specialized knowledge.

Philosophy for children asserts that children are capable of and interested in dealing with the problems of philosophy but are kept from doing so by philosophy's difficult terminology. Research and testing have indicated, however, that it is possible to present philosophy to children in a way that circumvents the terminology.

Reed next addressed the question, What is the practice of philosophy for children like? In a typical classroom, a teacher trained in philosophy for children leads the session; in the following example, the discussion focuses on a text. Children take turns reading out loud a paragraph or so of a novel until, as a group, they finish the book. The teacher then solicits the ideas that the children found most interesting, and those ideas become the agenda for discussion. The teacher facilitates inquiry, moving from the specific to the general. That is where things become problematic; it is not enough simply to tell teachers to lead children through inquiry. They need a model.

Reed next sketched out some details of the inquiry process. Essential to inquiry is "scholarly ignorance." The traditional classroom concentrates on the accumulation of knowledge, but the inquiry model requires us to admit that there are things we do not know and that there is something to be gained by the process of inquiry. Along with ignorance must go a desire to figure things out, to avoid seeing things as closed or settled. Then, one must see an idea or a group of concepts as problematic—in other words, curiosity must have a focus. Lastly, the teacher must be familiar with the rules and processes of the discipline, or disciplines, in which inquiry takes place.

The task of leading classroom inquiry is indeed daunting. In addition to the above considerations, the teacher must see that student dialogue contributes to the process of inquiry. Reed presented a checklist for the mechanics of discussion:

1) *The problem of the extent and the type of direction*. There are dangers in both underdirecting and overdirecting the dialogue. Dialogue needs nurturing and monitoring; Reed suggests thinking of the teacher as an apprentice conductor of skilled musicians. He or she leads, but always on the basis of cues given by the players.

2) *The nature of teacher talk.* Ideally everyone, including the teacher, should have an equal opportunity to speak. That is rarely the case, so teachers must keep in mind that if one person dominates, or refuses to participate, the community of inquiry loses effectiveness.

3) *The difficulty of translation.* The objective, says Reed, is to capture "this fluid thing called a meaning" and present it as intact as possible to the listener.

4) *Feelings and the rough-and-tumble of discourse.* It is the teacher's responsibility to see that children run as little risk of psychological injury as possible when they speak.

5) *The traditional model of education: the teacher as filter.* The teacher must maintain a delicate balance that neither allows discussion to stray too far from the "text" (art object, theory, etc.) nor precludes issues that arise from the text.

6) *The abuse of the controversial.* If inquiry is to take place, one must be prepared to follow wherever it may lead. At the same time, inquiry should not be subject to the artificial stimulation that controversy provides.

7) *Interest as starting point.* The children's interest must provide the starting point for inquiry.

8) *Pedagogical reasons for avoiding indoctrination.* In addition to being unethical, a "hidden agenda" devalues the inquiry process one is trying to encourage.

9) *The clock.* Teachers should work toward some sense of coherence, not closure, so that children can see how the parts of the discussion are beginning to come together. Reed cautioned about the overuse of personal anecdotes, and also about the fear of silences: dialogue consists of both words and the spaces between words.

10) *The use and misuse of humor.* Of course, inquiry brings with it a certain amount of humor, but humor also can deflect attention from the subject. It is better, Reed said, to avoid the joke.

Inquiry is not something that can just be tacked on to scholastic endeavor. If the field is serious about inquiry, then it must see that teachers themselves are taught through methods of inquiry. That will foster widespread progress in education.

Saturday Morning Breakout Sessions: New Voices on Growing up with Philosophy and Aesthetics

GROUP A

GROUP LEADER

Terry Barrett

PARTICIPANTS

Donna Kay Beattie, Diane Brigham, Jerilynn Changar, Faith Clover, Kristin G. Congdon, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, Susan R. Euler, E. Barry Gaither, George Geahigan, Michael Kendall, Beverly W. Krieger, Janis Norman, Sarah Otto-Diniz, Ronald Reed, Becky Reese, Martin Rosenberg, Robert Sitton, Mary Stokrocki, Jay Ulbricht, Barbara Weinstein, Enid Zimmerman

---

Much of this group's discussion centered on how to prepare teachers adequately to engage in the teaching of aesthetics. Within the DBAE model, aesthetics is perhaps the most problematic of the four disciplines because it receives the least attention in preservice training. As a consequence, teachers are ill-prepared and often afraid to teach aesthetics.

It would help, the group agreed, if teacher educators themselves taught by inquiry methods. As Janis Norman pointed out, teachers teach as they were taught. Thus, it was suggested that instruction by methods of inquiry could pay dividends, not only in aesthetics but also in the other disciplines, since inquiry is central to all of them. Rather than try to turn teachers into aestheticians, or even art historians, critics, or artists, their preservice training should help them understand which questions are worth asking. "It is not a question of what knowledge is to be transmitted, but of stimulating inquiry," said Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi.

It is necessary to deal with methods of inquiry in an integrated way, because it is not practical to prepare teachers adequately and equally in all four disciplines. Perhaps it is more realistic to expect strengths in one or two of the disciplines instead of a uniform expertise in all of them. Rather than try to define and impart a specific body of knowledge, then, it may be more useful for teacher educators to think in terms of ways of knowing. After all, learning is a lifelong process; it does not stop at graduation. Methods of inquiry empower teachers for that lifelong learning process. It was suggested that teachers might be actively recruited from among students who are studying art history, aesthetics, and criticism, as well as from the usual pool of studio artists —the main criterion being that teacher candidates must be willing to engage in continuous philosophical inquiry.

Of course, a certain amount of subject-specific knowledge is necessary for the teaching of aesthetics. Teachers should be able to talk about the philosophical impetus that compelled an artist to make an art object, for example, and they should be familiar with the sources that would allow them to do that. But they also must deal with the question of the relationship between truth and art. Michael Kendall pointed out that the answer always will be subjective; what is important is that the question be constantly addressed.

What aesthetics asks of DBAE, Kendall went on, is a larger context for the work of art, to "recontextualize the art object back

into the realm of truth and art." If the art object is a self-reflection, then teachers should be capable of self-analysis. For that, they must be trained both in specific aesthetic knowledge and in methods of inquiry.

We should encourage art education students to seek art experiences for personal growth as part of their life-long learning. Instead of just fulfilling their course requirements and graduating, teachers in training should maintain an active personal involvement with art objects, so that they can talk about those objects. The same is true of students in kindergarten through grade twelve.

Teachers would further benefit from learning to value questioning from their students. As several in the group pointed out, in the past the whole American educational system has devalued questioning. Now, with the current concern about developing children's analytical skills, that is changing. DBAE is thus in tune with other movements, and its emphasis on methods of inquiry can be transferred by students to other areas as well. This gives art teachers something to offer to the entire educational process. In effect, said Janis Norman, the goal is to teach students how to frame questions so that they can better understand the world in which they live.

The participants agreed that one of the tasks of DBAE is to foster positive attitudes toward inquiry and scholarship in art teachers and to create a process that will enhance their interest, not only in art, but also in continuous learning.

GROUP B

GROUP LEADER

Gilbert Clark

PARTICIPANTS

Ann Calvert, John S. Crawford, Hermine Feinstein, Paulette S. Fleming, Lynn Galbraith, Sharon R. Gray, W. Dwaine Greer, Sandra Gregor, Eldon Katter, Richard LaTour, Connie Newton, Martin P. Rayala, Mindy J. Richman, Jeanne Rollins, W. Jackson Rushing, Amy Brook Snider, Christine Thompson, Patricia Tinsman-Schaffer, Suzanne M. Wilson

---

As Gilbert Clark commented, the only things this group agreed on were that aesthetics should be taught in the classroom and taught through inquiry.

The challenge of deciding what aesthetic concepts are appropriate for each grade levels was a topic of major concern for participants. Many agreed that, while a teacher may use less sophisticated language to talk about aesthetics with young children, aesthetic concepts are appropriate for all ages. Teachers can impart skills, such as the ability to think clearly, that are involved in aesthetics but do not constitute formal aesthetics. Children have a natural propensity for inquiry that lends itself to the discipline, and educators may be underestimating the aesthetic vocabulary children bring with them into the classroom. As John Crawford said, teachers push toward abstract concepts, but we are all asking the same questions—Why is this pretty? What do I like about it? Paulette Fleming likened the de-

bate over which words to use in aesthetic instruction to the teaching of sex education and said it reminded her of the comment, "Should we teach children about aesthetics or should we let them learn it in the streets?" Most in the group felt that an attempt should be made to structure and sequence the teaching of aesthetics, so that what students learn in one grade level can then be expanded in the next.

Although teachers often assume that they are not teaching aesthetics, whenever they say, "this is art," they are doing just that. Dwaine Greer told of bringing two student artworks into class and asking students which one should get an A. The students almost all agreed, he said, which demonstrates that they already carried with them a notion of what good art is. The important thing is to get students to examine the whole set of unchallenged assumptions that leads them to respond as they do. Those assumptions, in fact, are what DBAE calls into question.

Another point of contention was the relationship between aesthetics and the other disciplines. Some felt that DBAE creates problems when it considers the disciplines separately, since in the classroom a teacher is likely to make use of all four within a single discussion. On the other hand, one group member wondered if it might not be more effective to consider aesthetics as a separate model, a kind of base from which to approach art history, criticism, and studio production. However, as Greer pointed out, one reason for DBAE's equal stress on the four disciplines is practical: otherwise, people would go in circles arguing which should come first. Ideally, the disciplines should be flexible enough to be integrated in the classroom, with discussion of an artwork incorporating many different emphases.

Ralph Smith felt that a teacher needs a number of different theories to address student questions. For instance, one of his art education students who was teaching in Chicago was asked by a student about the controversial work that encouraged viewers to walk on the American flag at the Art Institute of Chicago. "How much knowledge of aesthetics," Smith asked, "do you need to address such a question? How much art history? How much knowledge of contemporary art would help explain that work?"

Paulette Fleming acknowledged that not everyone is going to agree on exactly what to do in the classroom, since everyone has a slightly different definition of aesthetics. There are many possibilities, and perhaps aesthetics should be taught as a diversity of meanings. It is okay, she said, that aesthetics has not been clearly defined. Clark commented that everyone talks about aesthetics as a noun, a category that can be defined, when they should approach it as a verb, a method of inquiry.

Other concerns raised during the discussion included the following:

1) *Confronting philosophy-phobia in teachers.* It was agreed that teachers need more grounding in philosophy and in-depth inquiry.

2) *The perceived drive by many at the conference*

to get a program in place. Several group members feared this would lead to a rigid curriculum.

3) *The relatively small number of teachers at the conference*. Most participants at the conference believed that the dialogue needed everyone's input. Only if teachers are encouraged to be curriculum planners will DBAE acquire the flexibility it needs.

GROUP C

GROUP LEADER

Denise Lauzier-Stone

PARTICIPANTS

Sharon Blume, Joyce Brodsky, Judith Madden Bryant, John C. Chamberlin, Michael D. Day, Sandra Epps, Sally Hagaman, Laurie E. Hicks, William Hoey, Judith Koroscik, Elizabeth Kowalchuk, Kent Lydecker, Stanley S. Madeja, Jacques Maquet, Sally A. Myers, Jennifer Pazienza, Renee Sandell, Jon A. Sharer, Donald Soucy, Mary Ann Stankiewicz

---

The session began with questions for Ronald Reed. Reed had discussed in the plenary session how philosophy has changed in recent years, and he had explained the two traditions within philosophy: the continental and analytical approaches. The continental approach tends to examine the big questions (such as, What is art?), but analytical philosophers complain that it does so in a "muddle-headed" way. Analytic philosophy, on the other hand, concerns itself with very narrow questions in a very precise way. Now, said Reed, the divisions between the two are breaking down; philosophy is trying to deal with big questions in a precise way. New perspectives, such as feminist analysis of language and the philosophy-for-children approach, have widened the boundaries and contributed to the change.

Aesthetics as a discipline is so broad that it engenders a variety of approaches. The group spent some time discussing the prac-

tice of aesthetics in the classroom. Since the goal of aesthetic inquiry is to develop critical thinking skills, schools may not be aware of all the ramifications. When you begin inquiry, you must realize that students might question something you do not want them to question. It was noted that the other disciplines also involve aesthetic inquiry, which is, thus, one of the binding links among them.

Along these lines, the group discussed the centrality of the art object, as opposed to the art experience, in the study of aesthetics. No agreement was reached. Some argued that it is the object that stimulates questions and is the proper subject of aesthetics; others that the primary focus should be the art experience. There was some concern that teachers tend to slight art making when considering aesthetics because the discipline is so logocentric. One group member contended that philosophical, art historical, and critical questions are all relevant to art making; the challenge is to determine how they relate to art making. Another said that the goal of DBAE must be considered: Do we want to teach students to create form with meaning, or are we more interested in giving them an appreciation and an understanding of their visual environment? If the latter is the goal, then art production can no more be the discipline around which everything is based than can any one of the other three. The disciplines must not be compartmentalized; they must be integrated. It is especially important to relate activity in the studio to classroom activity.

One group member commented that aesthetics does not equal art; it encompasses a broad range of inquiry and is not necessarily tied to the object that propels it. The group urged further examination of the connections between aesthetics and art making to encompass philosophical, sociological, and cultural influences.

There was some talk about what goes on in the classroom and how that relates to the goals of aesthetic inquiry. The content and role of questions must be addressed, even while some of the answers are left open-ended. It is important to realize that teachers should not just be asking questions, but must be consciously guiding analytic discussion. One suggestion was to develop a sequence of general questions appropriate for children according to age group and to use the questions as a model, though not an absolute one. Another suggestion was to encourage students to generate their own questions, with the teacher responding to them and guiding the dialogue.

In order to empower children to talk about art, teachers themselves must be empowered. There needs to be a fusion of aesthetic experience and aesthetic education; the teacher must go through the aesthetic experience in order to learn to talk about it. In addition to studio production, attention must be given to responding and thinking about the question, What is art? Teachers need an information base to know what they and their students are searching for. In any case, aesthetic questions must be related to the specific activities in which the children are engaged; otherwise, the

children will not make connections.

The goals of DBAE are demanding, the group concluded. They require lifelong training on the teacher's part. It was suggested that DBAE would benefit from an ongoing relationship of experts inside and outside the field of art. Perhaps some sort of system could be set up whereby experts would act as visiting scholars for an extended period of time, rather than impart their knowledge and experience during short visits to conferences.

GROUP D

GROUP LEADER

Michael Parsons

PARTICIPANTS

Rebecca Brooks, Margaret Burchenal, Margaret DiBlasio, Dennis Fehr, John G. Hanhardt, Larry A. Kantner, Sharon Jacques, Andra N. Johnson, Nancy MacGregor, Jane Maitland-Gholson, Michael E. Ott, Judith Perry, Joan Peterson, Ronald Reed, Robert L. Russell, Jeffery S. Seibert, Frances Thurber, Sydney Walker

---

The two major topics this session addressed were the structure and content of aesthetics and the difficulties of teacher training. Michael Parsons began by asking whether aesthetics should be taught for its own sake or as an aid in the study of artworks. This led to a discussion of whether it is preferable to write aesthetic inquiry into the curriculum or to let students initiate questions, with teachers responding to the questions as they arise. Robert Russell pointed out that philosophy concerns questions of concept that arise out of all four disciplines, thus, questions come up constantly. Furthermore, questions cannot be neatly categorized into art history, criticism, aesthetics, and studio production. Russell advocated writing fundamental questions (such as, What is art?) into the curriculum. In the upper grade levels, it may be possible to teach in a more specialized manner, but in the lower grades it is better to integrate aesthetics with the other three disciplines. There will always be some overlap among

the disciplines—Maurice Sevigny pointed out that Is it art? is a critical as well as an aesthetic question—but, according to Russell, a good teacher will know which direction to pursue in discussion.

There was general agreement that aesthetics is the most problematic of the disciplines. It is not taught in many DBAE schools because teachers either do not know what it is or do not know how to handle it. Perhaps DBAE has overfocused on aesthetic scanning at the expense of modes of inquiry. "Do we want to teach a response behavior, or, instead, should we be teaching students how to ask questions?" Sevigny inquired.

There was some discussion about the need to define what aesthetics encompasses, especially in terms of the role of beauty. Dennis Fehr reported asking his art education majors what aesthetics was about and repeatedly receiving the answer, "the science of beauty." That struck him as anachronistic, since twentieth-century philosophy (also the twentieth-century artist) is not particularly concerned with beauty. Still, beauty is an important concept for young children, and many of their questions revolve around it. Perhaps it should be considered as one of many topics, rather than as central to aesthetics; in any case, teachers must be prepared to address it. Michael Ott recalled Ronald Reed's comment that teachers should not be completely deferential to a work of art. Honest aesthetic questions involve questions of art and beauty. Teachers should not be afraid to raise them.

This led to a discussion of how to empower teachers to ask questions. One concern was that children may be far more eager to raise questions than teachers are; by not following their students' lead, teachers may squelch inquiry. Teachers' perceptions of their roles—that they are authority figures responsible for handing down information—need to be changed.

One way to do that is to focus on the topics that arise naturally out of classroom discussions and to shape an aesthetics curriculum accordingly, rather than try to impose a series of abstract concepts.

Frances Thurber noted that teachers are not trained simply to ask questions but to be models as well. Teachers have to come to some understanding of key concepts so they can pose relevant questions; they must also direct students to ask questions.

Teachers also need a model. So often in inservice education programs, they are simply told what that model should be. But it is not enough simply to tell a teacher that he or she should listen to students and encourage inquiry; you have to show him or her *how* to go about this. Teachers need a model in preservice, and guided practice in inservice. Jane Maitland-Gholson pointed out that we are asking teachers to modify their behavior in a big way, especially considering the lack of an aesthetics background on the part of many of them. Still, teachers make aesthetic decisions every day, and they need a structure for the concepts that underlie those decisions. They also need to understand that using modes of inquiry is a learning process for them too.

Teachers may know how to start inquiry

but not how to keep it going; modeling and guided practice are effective ways to provide them with these skills. Above all, teachers should be empowered to raise questions whether or not they have the answers—a difficult task, the group admitted, given many of the trends (set curricula, standardized testing, authoritarian controls) in education today. As Maitland-Gholson pointed out, flexibility and integration are paramount: you cannot dismiss a student's question by saying, "Today is Tuesday. We are not doing aesthetics."

GROUP E

GROUP LEADER

Patricia Amburgy

PARTICIPANTS

Kay Alexander, Nancy Berry, Sharon Blume, James M. Clark, Carolyn Cochrane, Lila Crespin, Mary Erickson, Linda F. Ettinger, Glenda Gentry, Susan Mayer, Harold McWhinnie, Al Nickel, Richard Shiff, Thomas Shuell, Ralph A. Smith, Marvin Spomer, Mary P. Taylor, Robyn Turner, Trudy Wilson, Anne G. Wolcott, Philip Yenawine

---

The group began by discussing the relationship between the disciplines and how each should be taught. Although a teacher probably engages in all four disciplines nearly simultaneously, it is helpful to define and talk about each area separately because we must consider the issue of teacher training (and the lack of aesthetic training, especially for general classroom teachers). Kay Alexander thinks of the disciplines as counterpoint music—four voices, each with its own identity, intertwined. Sometimes the emphasis in the classroom will be on one, sometimes on another; the emphasis is always changing.

Marilyn Stewart was asked if she could articulate the difference in process between criticism and aesthetics, since the two often seem commingled. Stewart replied that criticism is more specific, requiring engagement with a particular art object, while philosophy is broader, encompassing art or art experiences in general. She does not be-

lieve that particular artworks demand particular aesthetic theories; for example, you do not need special instruction in contemporary art to engage in philosophical inquiry, but you would to engage in criticism. Contemporary works are so full of ideas, Philip Yenawine added, that philosophical discourse is almost natural.

As for separating the disciplines, Stewart likened this to unpacking a suitcase to make sure you have everything you need. Before departure, the suitcase gets packed up again. Teachers need to deal with the disciplines in an integrated way. What they are unpacking is the child's experience with art as well as art itself. The significance of tying things together with philosophical inquiry —which helps children understand their experiences—must never be forgotten.

People have monstrous expectations of philosophy, Mary Erickson observed, and we need to put those behind us. She agrees with Stewart that "the juices are in integration of the disciplines." Although it is conceivable to develop curricula with any one of the four as the prime mover, we must also give adequate service to the other three.

The issue of separating the disciplines also arose in regard to teacher training. What sort of content should be taught—knowledge and concepts or processes and modes of inquiry? It was agreed that teachers benefit from learning through inquiry, rather than simply receiving content. But a major concern was how best to educate teachers in DBAE quickly; as Lila Crespin commented, although inquiry may be the superior form of learning, it is also the slowest. Ronald Reed countered that it may, however, be the most efficient. Children tend to remember a very low percentage of what they hear in lectures, and the best lecturers rely on repetition to increase learning, by emphasizing the same point in three or four different ways. Repetition is built into the community of inquiry. Furthermore, it would appear that you remember more of what *you* say than what someone else says, and this would be another advantage of learning through methods of inquiry.

The group considered the question of whether it is possible, with art education often limited to one course, to prepare general classroom teachers to teach DBAE. Lila Crespin told of a study she recently completed that sought to discover and prioritize the factors that would influence an art specialist to teach DBAE. The first was a curriculum-driven approach. Whether district-written or formal, the curriculum had to have scope and sequence. The second factor was district support for DBAE —for the curriculum and for the teacher's methods. The third was preservice training. It came as a surprise to Crespin that this was number three; she had expected it to be number one. She feels that the study illustrates the need for DBAE to develop an accurate curriculum goal.

Mary Erickson agreed. Citing what she calls her "battle metaphor," she contended that it is cruel to send teachers out without consistent support lines, weapons, and tactical support. There are some broad-based curricula in place, but much more needs to be done. Crespin added that in doing in-

service training at the Getty Institutes, she has discovered that the process is too slow. If we have to depend on that training, DBAE will never be in place. That is another reason that the program needs its own inherent curricula, both for generalists and for art teachers. There must be some structure on to which they can hang, even if that structure is not perfect.

DBAE will have to address the problems faced by teachers working within an organizational structure that does not promote cross-disciplinary interaction. Just as children and teachers are not prepared for DBAE because they have not been encouraged to think across the disciplines, so the systems in which teachers work are not prepared for this approach. Linda Ettinger noted that schools almost never allow team-teaching. This is an excellent way to share methodologies and broaden perspectives, but schools find the cost prohibitive.

The discussion ended with a return to the question, What is aesthetics? The question remained unresolved, but Harold McWhinnie suggested that the answer might lie in a differentiation between the field of inquiry and the various methodologies used in aesthetics. What scares teachers is that they think they are expected to teach the history of the philosophy of aesthetics, rather than teach aesthetic inquiry. It would be useful to make a distinction between the content of the discipline and the process of inquiry.

Triangulation #5:
New Voices on Evaluation and DBAE Teaching Effectiveness

SPEAKERS
Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi
Department of Behavioral Sciences,
University of Chicago

Jane Maitland-Gholson
Art Education Department, University of Oregon

Suzanne M. Wilson
Department of Teacher Education,
Michigan State University

Top: Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi
Left: Suzanne M. Wilson
Right: Jane Maitland-Gholson

Summary of Remarks by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi

The focus of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's presentation was a comparison of the way students learn the sciences and the arts. He noted that the differences are distinct, the most profound being that intrinsic enjoyment of the sciences is comparatively rare, whereas the arts are intrinsically satisfying from the very beginning.

A recent study of talented adolescents illustrates the point. The study involved more than 200 students nominated by teachers for their outstanding talent in art, athletics, mathematics, music, and science. The students carried a beeper that went off eight times a day at randomly chosen moments, prompting them to indicate on a response sheet where they were, what they were doing, and about what they were thinking; they rated their feelings on numerical scales. The technique, which Csikszentmihalyi calls the "experience sampling method" (ESM), permits precise comparisons of the quality of experiences.

Csikszentmihalyi found that students gifted in math or science tended to feel worse than usual when involved in these subjects, while students gifted in art or music tended to feel better than their weekly average when involved in their subjects. The motivation of science and math students decreased when they were doing those subjects; the motivation of the art and music students increased when they were doing their subjects.

Also, when students talented in math or science were involved in art or music, their moods improved. But when students whose talents were in art and music worked on science or math, their moods became depressed. Csikszentmihalyi offered three reasons why the arts encourage enjoyment while the sciences do not; each has some truth, he said, but none by itself is sufficient to explain this phenomenon. The possibilities are these: that students learn to dislike the hard sciences early; that math and science are taught in a way that predisposes students to dislike them; or that the subject matter is inherently depressing.

This is not to suggest that the arts are easy. There is no contradiction in recognizing the difficulties encountered in artistic production and, at the same time, the joy it can give. We must understand what promotes happiness. Most people, when asked to cite what activity makes them happy, come up with experiences that involve a challenge.

The characteristics of these optimal experiences were the subject of research involv-

68

ing people pursuing intrinsically rewarding activities (including artists, rock-climbers, dancers, and chess players) to determine what features were perceived as rewarding and to define the psychic rewards. The characteristics seem to hold true for all groups and ages. When all the characteristics are present, the state of consciousness is called a "flow experience" because people described the feeling as like being carried away by a current.

The first characteristic was a merging of action and awareness, as if the actor and action had become one. This only happens, Csikszentmihalyi noted, when the person believes that the challenge is more or less in balance with his or her skills. When the challenge is greater than the skills, frustration results.

In addition, a flow experience usually occurs when the activity provides a clear goal, so that the person can get feedback on his or her actions. The goal, however, is not sought in and of itself; it is pursued because it makes the activity possible. Artists do not paint in order to have pictures; they create pictures so that they can paint.

In a flow experience, the person's attention is concentrated solely on the activity and other concerns fade away. The person loses any sense of self-consciousness, and it becomes possible to transcend the boundaries of one's being. Flow experiences make new experiences possible with no need to worry about the consequences. After the flow experience, however, the self reappears even stronger than before.

These are the universal characteristics associated with enjoyable experiences. The activity is autotelic, or rewarding in itself, even if one originally began it for an extrinsic reason (such as a good grade). Csikszentmihalyi makes a distinction between pleasure and enjoyment: pleasure does not encourage the development of new potentialities and does not foster personal growth. Enjoyment, by contrast, forces one to grow, because unless new challenges are faced, the person drifts into boredom. Enjoyment requires activity and ability; pleasure does not.

The arts, then, have a high degree of intrinsic rewards but tend rarely to provide extrinsic compensations. It could be said that the arts, which have a direct effect on experience, contribute more to the quality of life than the sciences. However, it was not Csikszentmihalyi's intent to decide that issue but rather to suggest that it might be a mistake to pattern the arts on the sciences in an attempt to gain respectability. In light of the characteristics of the responses of students to the study of art, it appears that art educators should be more concerned about what students are experiencing while they are involved with art than about what they are learning. Although the flow model indicates that a person must have the necessary skill level to meet challenges, the primary concern is the quality of the experience.

Summary of Remarks
by Jane Maitland-Gholson

Jane Maitland-Gholson's presentation dealt with several issues regarding testing. Her major themes were: the recognition of three meta-issues; the translation of measurement theory and practice into DBAE practice; and alternative ways to approach teacher assessment. She cautioned that art educators must walk a fine line between gaining legitimacy within the school system and becoming trapped by the same set of conventions that currently limit the system.

The meta-issues she put forth were: implicit assumptions about knowledge that affect assessment; the power of language to shape and limit thinking; and underlying notions of teacher effectiveness and accountability. These issues are never really resolved but should always be considered.

In her advanced curriculum class, Maitland-Gholson and her students discuss ideas about the nature of knowledge—whether it resides "out there" somewhere or in the mind, and what criteria we use to value knowledge. Unless we are clear about what can be known and how it happens, we will have inconsistent ideas about curriculum and assessment. The field has built its pedagogy on a shifting epistemological foundation. On the one hand, it is realistic and rationalistic, having faith in universal structures found in all minds. She calls this a product-oriented model and notes that it results in standardization, generalization, and efficiency. On the other hand, art educators harbor in their language and beliefs ideas of the importance of immediate sensuous experience and the shifting nature of knowledge according to context—a process model. The field must identify and examine such basic beliefs or it will find itself at cross-purposes.

Another "big picture" issue is the limits of language. In examining her charge to discuss "the cognitive dimensions of DBAE content," Maitland-Gholson became aware of a suggestion inherent in the phrase that content contains a discrete entity called cognition. But learners, not content, participate in cognition. In identifying content and discussing teacher or learner competence, we must consider what language allows us to think and say.

The third meta-issue concerns teacher accountability and power. The whole idea of accountability tends to treat education as a consumer product, with the teacher held responsible for delivering the goods for which tax dollars pay. Little is said about how the learners view the educational process; yet, in order to develop critical thinking skills, they will have to be participants—a view that challenges all the implicit assumptions of effectiveness, accountability, and assessment.

In discussing testing and measurement, Maitland-Gholson noted that conventional tests of cognitive aptitude do not consider the interplay of functions within a particular domain, nor do domain-specific achievement tests consider cognitive functions. The challenge is to describe the relationships between types of knowledge and types of process. Most models of assessment still consider knowledge as an objec-

tive reality. Therefore, there needs to be a stronger emphasis on contextually sensitive, nonstandardized approaches.

In working toward the development of such approaches, we must consider what the ultimate purpose is. There exists in education the notion that "one must crawl before one walks"; yet, this process of two-stage learning may shape information into conventions that block divergent and higher-order processing. With this hierarchical, sequential approach implicit in teacher assessment, we may be eliminating the very people—divergent, non-linear thinkers—whom we say we want as teachers.

Art education has the opportunity to develop new approaches that both demonstrate the acquisition of declarative knowledge and (concurrently, not sequentially) identify divergent processes. Three lessons emerge from the 4J Plan of the school district in Eugene, Oregon, which is developing student assessment instruments. First, a reliable test of a narrow range of art content is possible, but it has extreme limits in regard to process. Second, such tests work best when they are designed for a specific population (nonstandardized). Third, assessment of divergent thinking processes is in conflict with classic test theory and must get past embedded structures of educational discourse.

As an alternative, Maitland-Gholson suggests that we view teaching as a social act involving many sets of variables, more than can ever be identified by any classical testing method. One possible approach to contextually sensitive assessment would involve identifying the interpretive conventions used by teachers, children, and evaluators that align with the beliefs and values operating in the classroom. The philosophy behind this is pragmatic, not objective-realistic. In this model, the underlying characteristics of a community (cultural origins, beliefs, values) would be used to inform a set of interpretive conventions to understand the construction of meaning that takes place in the classroom. It would require curriculum goals that are consistent with community values, the ability to accept ambiguity in assessment, and respect for the abilities of teachers and learners to shape their processes of knowledge construction. Maitland-Gholson recognizes that this is a tall order, but feels it is one that might speak to the underlying beliefs of many art educators.

Summary of Remarks by Suzanne M. Wilson

Although she feels her teachers tried to extinguish any interest she had in art, Suzanne Wilson said she managed to develop an interest in and appreciation for the subject. But she did not learn any of those things in school. As a history teacher, she became interested in art as a form of history; her study of the history of art grew out of this interest.

As an outsider to the field of DBAE, Wilson believes that what was being said at the conference was that art, as a school subject, has to become something that matters to children and learners; that art makes a difference in people's lives; and that schools should be helping to make that difference possible.

Wilson noted that the issues surrounding teacher assessment in the field of history—especially whether or not assessment should be based on the discipline of history—have interesting analogs in art education. She presented some of the work being done on teacher assessment, such as the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University, which aims to establish a national certification process for all teachers. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which is cosponsoring the project, is interested in finding alternative ways to measure what teachers do in the classroom and what they know.

The project involves the development of exercises, or tests, that are different from the traditional forms of testing. One of several examples Wilson cited was that of a teacher sitting in a room looking at a videotape of another person teaching and then answering questions about what took place in the classroom— evaluating, interpreting, and responding to the teaching. Another example concerned a teacher being asked to critique a textbook using a variety of criteria. Some of the exercises have to do with what actually happens in classrooms (the teaching that specific teachers do with particular students), while others have to do with other aspects of teaching, like planning lessons or evaluating student papers.

These forms of assessment have not been used, said Wilson, because they require expert judgment, trusting that someone knows how to determine whether or not performance on the assessment is good or bad. Pencil and paper tests are much easier to create and score; however, a test such as the National Teachers' Exam (NTE) does not look much like teaching and may not test knowledge and skills essential to teaching. Narrowly focused, these tests might miss the heart of teaching.

Another reason these forms of assessment have not been used is that they are expensive and labor-intensive. They require time to talk to people about what they are doing. They are not efficient ways to evaluate teaching.

One of the characteristics of these exercises is that they are subject-specific, acknowledging that teaching is different across subject matters. They are also educative: they require teachers to talk to other teachers and evaluators, to reflect on their own experiences, and to look at and think about their teaching in ways that teachers often

do not have the opportunity to do. These exercises cast teaching as something about which one thinks, something that has a purpose and that teachers reason through. They put a heavy responsibility on teachers to justify their actions, which makes these forms of assessment very different from multiple-choice tests that do not ask teachers what they are doing when they teach.

No matter what form of assessment art educators choose, there are some questions that must be answered. One is, What is the nature of good teaching in art? If you are going to evaluate a teacher, you have to acknowledge that you have a standard by which you are making that decision. The problem is that *good teaching looks different all the time*. It does not look like one thing; it differs in individuals from day to day. What we really care about is whether students are learning things we think are important. The answer to the question, What is good teaching? is that it teaches students things that matter.

There is a problem measuring what students learn, because they learn over time. So we use teachers as proxies for what students are learning. But we have to remind ourselves that we do not care so much about the teacher as about what the students learn.

Using the teacher as proxy, the question is, What do teachers need to know, be able to do, believe in, and be disposed to do in order to be good teachers? Taking one discipline, What does it mean to know art history? Any number of art historians will give any number of answers, because there are multiple methods. We also have the question of content. "The stuff of history is interpretation," said Wilson, " it's about selecting whose story you tell." Given this lack of consensus, what do you want teachers to know about the discipline of art history? If every discipline involves similar debates about what is worth knowing, and DBAE is dealing with four disciplines, then you have a big dilemma.

Wilson encouraged the participants to think hard about the difference between art as a set of disciplines and art as a school subject. Schools are about things that matter to children, and sometimes disciplines do not help us in that. As a teacher, Wilson has to think hard about when to use the discipline and how, and when not to use the discipline. Teachers are not practitioners of the disciplines; they are practitioners of pedagogy.

Another question to consider is, Where do teachers learn these things? One of the risks art educators run is believing that if you just put enough things into a curriculum, it will be all right. But this does not work. We must think of teachers as students in this field; if you want children to know things, teachers must also know those things.

Wilson noted that the alternative forms of assessment she had described were educative. She suggested devising ways to measure what teachers knew and were able to do in classrooms that were also designed to teach them the things they should know. To evaluate good teaching, you have to show that a person is disposed toward learning

new things.

In closing, Wilson urged participants not to lose sight of their goal, which, as she sees it, is to get schools to acknowledge that art matters, and to help teachers find ways to make sure art matters, in their classrooms and in the classrooms of other teachers.

Saturday Afternoon Breakout Sessions: New Voices on Evaluation and DBAE Teaching Effectiveness

GROUP A

GROUP LEADER

Terry Barrett

PARTICIPANTS

Donna Kay Beattie, Diane Brigham, Jerilynn Changar, Faith Clover, Kristin G. Congdon, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, Susan R. Euler, E. Barry Gaither, George Geahigan, Michael Kendall, Beverly W. Krieger, Janis Norman, Sarah Otto-Diniz, Ronald Reed, Becky Reese, Martin Rosenberg, Robert Sitton, Mary Stokrocki, Jay Ulbricht, Barbara J. Weinstein, Enid Zimmerman

---

The group addressed many of the early questions to Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, who sat in with this group for part of the discussion. In response to a question about how to challenge students so that they respond joyfully, he cautioned that an adult's idea of a challenge may be quite different from a child's. When he talked to artists to find out how they came to be involved in art making, he discovered that often it was because they were eager to attract attention by doing things that others could not do. Although a student might respond joyfully to these things—decorating a classroom, for example—a teacher might not think of them as a challenge. Teachers must discover the particular challenge that an individual child might want to undertake, and, giving careful consideration to the child's interest and skill level, take it from there—thus disguising the teacher's challenge in the child's.

There was substantial discussion about Csikszentmihalyi's contention that art students feel less anxiety than other students. Although he did not work with a sample of adult artists, the idea for his study came from examining artists at work and how they immerse themselves in the flow experience. He pointed out that after an artist completes a work, he or she often puts it away and is no longer interested in it. Art making is not a goal-directed activity; it is the activity itself that generates the reward and the joy. Perhaps this is why students respond to art as they do: they get immediate rewards, they set their own goals, and they have more control over the activity than they would in other areas.

Why, then, Csikszentmihalyi was asked, do so many teachers—especially general classroom teachers—report having a bad experience with art in their preservice training? In his experience, teachers who have a hard time teaching art are trying to apply the same techniques they use for other subject matters. Yet one cannot teach art effectively in the same way that one teaches other subjects.

In response to Csikszentmihalyi's study, the group concluded that more assessment is needed to document the joy of responding to art—Does the flow experience when looking at an artwork occur, for example, in terms of losing self-consciousness, asking questions, and getting feedback? If so, teachers need to develop observation techniques to make them sensitive to the experience, and they must devise ways to foster that experience so that it happens more often.

Some group members wondered if Csikszentmihalyi's research methods might

have slanted the outcome of the study. The art students who participated were selected on the basis of teacher recommendation, as were the math students; that may be a poor way to select a sample population, since the children selected are the ones who are doing what the teachers want. Also, perhaps one should take into consideration that art courses often are graded pass/fail, which could affect the levels of anxiety experienced by students. Enid Zimmerman reported that she has found results that conflict with Csikszentmihalyi's on a number of points: art students tend to be social rather than withdrawn, they consider the attitudes of parents and peers important, and they respond to both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

The group felt that intrinsic motivation by itself is not sufficient. Barry Gaither noted that, as the director of a neighborhood museum, he often gets calls from people who want to steer children who draw into some kind of art instruction. That suggests that schools are not supportive of the children's behavior—drawing cartoon characters is seen as inappropriate, for example. Most of the children outgrow their interest, and this may say something about lost options, about how artistic impulses may fail to take root when their manifestations are treated as *extracurricular*. It also suggests that children do need external motivation, support, and praise to strengthen their desires. Extrinsic rewards are important, and we need to consider parents and peers in discussions of motivational structures.

Gaither also commented on devices of motivation. For instance, he has found that children respond well to presentations of their own work and that of their peers. They see a big difference in the value of a rough work and one on display; presentation of a work gives them a sense of ownership and helps them evaluate what they have done.

There was substantial interest in a program at Gaither's museum that trains fifth graders to give docent tours for regularly scheduled exhibitions. The semester-long training includes instruction in public speaking as well as art. Not only must students learn the material, but they must also transform it for others (third and fourth graders, and one group of adults for whom they give the tour). This is a useful evaluation technique, according to Gaither, who has found that although students may not give the interpretation the teacher intended, their personal interpretation has a logic they can explain. Another kind of evaluation—from the student's perspective—arose when Gaither discovered that some children were telling people they worked at the museum, were bringing their own groups, and were conducting their own tours. Obviously they enjoyed the program and felt comfortable at the museum.

GROUP B

GROUP LEADER

Gilbert Clark

PARTICIPANTS

Ann Calvert, John S. Crawford, Hermine Feinstein, Paulette S. Fleming, Lynn Galbraith, Sharon R. Gray, W. Dwaine Greer, Sandra Gregor, Eldon Katter, Richard LaTour, Connie Newton, Martin P. Rayala, Mindy J. Richman, Jeanne Rollins, W. Jackson Rushing, Amy Brook Snider, Christine Thompson, Patricia Tinsman-Schaffer, Suzanne M. Wilson

---

Suzanne Wilson remained with the group throughout the session; most of the discussion focused on her presentation. The topics discussed included characterizations of teachers and teaching methods, the distinction between curriculum and instruction, and the nature of assessment.

Asked whether there was research to support the notion that teachers change the way they teach according to which subject they are addressing, Wilson noted that people do not often attend to differences in subject matter in their research. There is no research that focuses on that question exclusively in terms of art teachers. However, studies of what constitutes good teaching do describe a variation across subject matter: a good math teacher's methodology changes when he or she teaches social studies, for example. Within subject areas the variation might not appear. Group members discussed the need for different forms of teaching, since drawing, for example, is different from ceramics; they wondered if that need for different approaches could somehow be built into assessment.

Wilson noted that choices of what is to be included in assessment can push the field in specific directions. In looking at twelve social studies teachers as part of a study of good teaching, she found that all had reported that collaboration within their departments was encouraged. This was not the norm elsewhere, but an exercise requiring collaboration was included in the teacher certification evaluation. Thus, various school districts were forced to facilitate collaboration. It is important to realize that developing an assessment program requires making normative decisions. Although assessment is based on empirical work, teaching is not purely empirical. We have to be very careful, then, in making decisions about what should be included: assessment can drive curriculum in good ways, but good ideas can also get twisted.

Asked whether there is any research that tries to link teaching styles with learning styles, Wilson replied that she does not find the concept very helpful, because any study that looks at the behavioral aspects of teaching without looking at cognition is missing the point. You must also look at what the teacher is thinking and how that fits into the broader perspective of what the teacher is doing. Talking about developmental stages may be a helpful heuristic, but children in a classroom are developing along different dimensions. "To say Suzy has a particular learning style makes no sense," Wilson insisted. "I have learning styles that vary

according to what I am learning." Teaching and learning styles are more helpful to consider as variables when one attempts to understand particular cases of teaching.

The group also addressed the question of differences between teaching, instruction, and curriculum. Dwaine Greer talked about the difference between looking at whether a teacher has delivered particular ideas and modes of inquiry (as defined by the discipline) and assessment, which is based on whether the ideas delivered and the students' mastery of them matches the original model. He considers that a fairly narrow task, in comparison with evaluating the teacher's aesthetic stance and how he or she interacts with students. Greer feels that in order to translate a program district-wide, it would be necessary to examine the narrower model.

Wilson replied that the narrow model may not best serve DBAE's interests, since it requires a belief in the "warehouse" system of knowledge as set forth in Philip Jackson's *The Practice of Teaching*. The warehouse metaphor suggests that teaching is a system of delivering products: assessment allows us to see what students have learned by presenting a receipt and asking for our package—the knowledge memorized and stored.

As an alternative, Jackson suggested that children are more like a digestive system; that is, they do not just absorb information, they digest it and get rid of what they do not want. Of course, this makes assessment problematic. But, as Wilson said, if we want teachers to think hard about important goals and integrate them into into their teaching, it may not be possible simultaneously to make sure everyone is doing the right thing at the same time. We need to loosen the reins and help teachers understand DBAE rather than develop accountability systems that do not even measure what we want them to. In terms of national certification, how do you standardize when you want teachers to be flexible?

One thing on which the group did seem to agree was that we need a variety of methods for teacher instruction, especially since, as John Crawford put it, DBAE requires teachers to wear many hats. We have to give teachers a chance to see what goes on in different fields with different dynamics. In addition to modeling, reflection and practice are necessary for good teaching, and these things should start in preservice and continue throughout a teacher's career.

GROUP C

GROUP LEADER

Denise Lauzier-Stone

PARTICIPANTS

Sharon Blume, Joyce Brodsky, Judith Madden Bryant, John C. Chamberlin, Michael D. Day, Sandra Epps, Sally Hagaman, Laurie E. Hicks, William Hoey, Judith Koroscik, Elizabeth Kowalchuk, Kent Lydecker, Stanley S. Madeja, Jacques Maquet, Sally A. Myers, Jennifer Pazienza, Renee Sandell, Jon W. Sharer, Donald Soucy, Mary Ann Stankiewicz

---

This group's broad-ranging discussion of evaluation encompassed issues of how students learn, standardized tests, and alternative evaluation techniques. It was pointed out that measurement devices require drawing inferences from student behavior about what has been learned. Not only do such inferences prove unreliable, but they also fail to consider cognition. One suggestion for obtaining specificity was the use of criteria-referenced objectives by teachers; another was to have teachers identify what they want students to learn and summarize the means they will employ. Judith Koroscik noted that she asks her undergraduates to write down their objectives and, below that, to list their evaluation strategies. This sometimes means that teachers must create instructional materials specifically geared to their objectives. She admits that this takes a great deal of time, and teachers must be convinced that the strategy is worth it. This technique has the added benefit, however, of getting teachers to think about why they are showing particular works and what they want students to learn from them. Judith Bryant advocated encouraging students, under the guidance of their teachers, to be responsible for assessing their own work in relation to the criteria provided.

The group considered the problems inherent in standardized testing, whether at the state or national level. For one thing, the content of art classes is extremely varied, as are instructional methods. For another, standardized testing tends to ignore high-level thinking skills. Furthermore, the cost of testing often forces a pencil-and-paper kind of evaluation, which is not suitable for art.

As Mary Ann Stankiewicz pointed out, however, including art in state tests at least ensures that it will be taught. She reported that the Educational Testing Service (ETS) is revising the National Teachers' Examination (NTE) for art; it will still be a pencil-and-paper test, but the field is now in a position to advocate other methods. She discussed a plan in California to test university art education students for their mastery of subject matter before they graduate. The push is for multiple evaluative strategies, including portfolios, interviews, and qualitative approaches. Art educators are determining how the test will approach teacher knowledge of art by looking at models of assessment from other fields, such as English and elementary education.

There was some concern that testing would limit the curriculum, especially if applied to such a varied field. Still, most

group members agreed with Stankiewicz that testing would at least ensure the inclusion of some art training in undergraduate education departments. It was agreed that state-mandated testing should serve the aims of the student as well as the state, which is why Stankiewicz advocates giving the criteria to students in advance. In that way, testing also can function as a teaching tool. If students know in advance what the test will include, they can structure their curriculum accordingly.

The group agreed that alternative models of evaluation are needed and discussed several. One was the Dutch art examination, which centers on the portfolio. As Michael Day noted, there are significant ways in which the United States differs from the Netherlands that would require alteration of the Dutch model; for one thing, in Holland the test comes directly out of the curriculum, which is devised by teachers and is fairly standardized. In this country, the Dutch model would be more appropriately applied on the state rather than on the national level. Still, we could learn much by examining the strategies used by the Dutch model to overcome the pencil-and-paper mindset.

Another form of evaluation suggested was interactive video. In response to concerns that this might handicap certain segments of the population who do not have easy access to computers (or who fear them), it was noted that the medium should be explored as a teaching device before it is used for testing. Again, the costs might prove prohibitive. But the group felt that alternative models were promising and should be explored.

GROUP D

GROUP LEADER

Michael Parsons

PARTICIPANTS

Rebecca Brooks, Margaret Burchenal, Margaret DiBlasio, Dennis Fehr, John G. Hanhardt, Larry A. Kantner, Sharon Jacques, Andra N. Johnson, Nancy MacGregor, Jane Maitland-Gholson, Michael E. Ott, Judith Perry, Joan Peterson, Ronald Reed, Robert L. Russell, Jeffery S. Seibert, Frances Thurber, Sydney Walker

---

The group began its discussion by considering the differences between curriculum-centered and child-centered approaches and how DBAE fits into the framework. One participant was concerned that DBAE seemed so intent on establishing a curriculum. Is DBAE, in part, a response to the drive for accountability? If so, there is a danger that DBAE could encourage teachers to adhere to a set curriculum rather than respond to the "pushes and pulls" of the classroom. The group felt that, although DBAE should strive to develop a sound curriculum, once that is achieved, teachers should not feel bound by the curriculum.

These comments led to a discussion of the need to create an atmosphere in the classroom that allows students to have fun. Frances Thurber suggested that the curriculum-versus-child-centered dichotomy does not apply to DBAE; she advocated thinking of DBAE as content-centered. If the content is relevant to the development of an understanding of who we are, then it

is meaningful for both teachers and students. Certainly how the teacher presents and responds to the content affects the classroom. It is much more profitable to address content issues than simply to have fun, but the two aims are not incompatible, just as child-centered and content-centered approaches are not mutually exclusive.

As for the climate in the classroom, one group member pointed out that DBAE might help to forge new relationships between the specialist and the general classroom teacher. The specialist often does not have time to create a warm atmosphere; the classroom teacher is the one "on the spot" when questions arise in day-to-day activity. A truly collaborative relationship between the two could produce an environment that encourages both learning and having fun.

In discussing the evaluation of teachers, Nancy MacGregor brought up the interesting point that teaching is one of the few professions in which constant monitoring is felt to be necessary; by suggesting that teachers need to be controlled, this monitoring may have contributed to a negative atmosphere. Among the different methods of evaluation discussed by the group was the Carnegie Commission's attempt to devise sophisticated tests that go beyond the pencil-and-paper approach. Michael Ott commented that the very act of assembling a portfolio is helpful for a student, over and above what the evaluator says, because it requires the student to deal with his or her own standards. However, an overreliance on portfolios might ignore other areas in which competence is needed, such as writing.

Given the high costs involved, the group expressed a major concern about the practicality of alternative methods of evaluation. But as Judith Perry noted, evaluation can have an educative effect too. She told of a writing test that is given to every eighth grader in her school district and evaluated by classroom teachers. Improvements have been documented every year, because teachers have become aware of their teaching methods by evaluating their students, and students have been inclined to work harder because they know they will be evaluated. Perry suggested coming up with a comparable system for art, which, like the writing test, would benefit both teachers and their students.

While testing confers legitimacy, there was some concern that evaluation, if it becomes too much of an issue, could twist the goals of DBAE. Michael Ott warned of overintellectualization. "It is dangerous," he said, "to shift the rationale from teaching a certain way because teachers and students are comfortable with the approach, to doing it because it has intellectual value and can be tested."

The group also considered the widespread changes that are occurring in art education and the discomfort that change itself can bring. One participant noted that at times he feels the field is suffering from an inferiority complex. But as several others pointed out, letting go of one thing and accepting another always creates uncertainty; ultimately, this need not be negative. Art education is a microcosm of the education field, and the whole field is facing the same kinds

of changes. "We are asking what an educated child should look like," said Judith Perry, "and at the same time we are dealing with a call from the government and the public for accountability, questioning how we can better the situation in art education and looking for a stance that children can reasonably apply to their world. All these interactions make us question everything even more."

GROUP I

GROUP LEADER

Patricia Amburgy

PARTICIPANTS

Kay Alexander, Carolyn Cochrane, Lila Crespin, Linda F. Ettinger, Glenda Gentry, Jane Maitland-Gholson, Harold McWhinnie, Jennifer Pazienza, Donald Soucy, Marvin Spomer, Trudy Wilson, Anne G. Wolcott

---

The group considered the question of what should be tested and how that relates to various forms of assessment. Jane Maitland-Gholson, who joined the group for the early part of the discussion, reiterated her stance on pragmatism. The field seems to be at odds philosophically. In terms of content and the delivery of content, art educators tend to be objective realists: instead of viewing children as active, involved learners, they believe that a certain body of knowledge exists, that it can be given as a gift to children, and that the children will readily accept it. On the other hand, art educators tend to be pragmatic in their basic belief in individuality and personal expression. There is a fundamental dichotomy here, and it shows up in the language used in the literature. If the pedagogy you practice holds that there is an external objective on which everyone can converge, then critical thinking and creative problem solving cannot occur.

Maitland-Gholson commented that we must look at testing pragmatically in terms of what will please the school boards. But that should not be the only consideration.

In teaching children the things that school boards wish to test, we tend to push aside other important issues. Ideally, the test itself should be a learning instrument, and it should evaluate the things the field believes are important. Going back to her opening statement, Maitland-Gholson said that the critical issue is how children are being taught —through active methods and dialogue or through the handing out of knowledge.

Patricia Amburgy wondered if there are important objectives that cannot be evaluated, or that cannot be evaluated immediately (such as intrinsic satisfaction). If we assume that works of art reveal ideas of human import—good and bad, right and wrong—can we develop an assesssment to discover if children are dealing with those ideas? Maitland-Gholson responded that some researchers are taping dialogues with children, examining the language they use, and trying to determine how they are arriving at those concepts. Pragmatically, of course, one must consider the time involved and whether or not teachers are willing to participate. Testing must involve the question of feasibility.

Lila Crespin asked the group to consider how assessment might show that art education contributes something unique to a child's life. "If we are talking about truth and goodness," she asked, "how do we differentiate what we are testing from other subjects that teach the same content?" The group agreed that what is unique to art education is its visual imagery; art education teaches students to create and interpret visual images. However, those two foci might require very different forms of testing, depending on whether one wishes to assess creation or interpretation.

Carolyn Cochrane noted that assessment should involve growth and progress in all four disciplines, and that in order to do so, it should use different approaches. Although Maitland-Gholson based her example on DBAE curriculum, she assessed only language; Cochrane suggested using a number of methods, including evaluation of portfolios over time, writing, and informal data gathered by observing teachers and students in the classroom. She also recognized the need to consider both the practical and the theoretical sides of implementation.

Amburgy noted that the most important question surrounding assessment is that of content. She invited comment on Suzanne Wilson's suggestion that there is a difference between art as a set of disciplines and art as a school subject. The group discussed the idea that what professionals do in the disciplines may not satisfy the educational concerns that teachers have for their students. Kay Alexander acknowledged that DBAE practitioners differ in opinion on that subject. Some believe in teaching children what an art historian does, for example. The DBAE literature says that one should derive what is taught from the disciplines, not necessarily in the style of the disciplines. There is, she suggested, a continuum of how closely people agree with that.

The group also considered the differences between general educational training in art and vocational training in art. Certainly, the emphasis is different. In general education,

one uses the disciplines for content and inquiry to approach greater issues, which is different from the way one trains professionals in the disciplines. Developmental levels are another important consideration, since specialized knowledge comes at different stages.

In discussing the assessment of teachers, Amburgy again made reference to Suzanne Wilson's contention that teachers are not practitioners of the art disciplines but of pedagogy. The group felt that both needed to be considered, since thorough grounding in the disciplines is necessary before one can be a good pedagogue. Harold McWhinnie commented that one of the problems with teachers' perceptions of DBAE is that they think they are going to have to be practitioners in four separate areas. But if the art teacher's role is becoming more like that of a generalist, he or she must be able to see and summarize the factors that unify the disciplines. Instead of focusing on specific knowledge in all the disciplines, perhaps we should be looking at how to assess the teacher's ability to integrate cross-disciplinary knowledge.

Triangulation #6:
Familiar Voices Respond to the New Voices and Reflect Upon Three Generations of DBAE Implementation

Left: Mary Ann Stankiewicz
Right: Ralph A. Smith

SPEAKERS
Ralph A. Smith
College of Education,
University of Illinois, Champaign

Mary Ann Stankiewicz
Department of Art, California State
University, Long Beach

Co-Authors of Third Generation Post-Conference Response:
Donna Kay Beattie, Susan R. Euler, Lynn Galbraith, Sharon R. Gray, Elizabeth Kowalchuk, Anna Martin, Sally A. Myers, Jeffery S. Seibert, Patricia Tinsman-Schaffer, Sydney Walker, Trudy Wilson, and Anne G. Wolcott

Summary of Remarks by Ralph A. Smith

Ralph Smith is one of a number of first-generation theorists who anticipated the idea of DBAE. Smith related how during the 1960s he thought it was important for art education to draw attention to serious and mature works of art as loci of value. He thereby sought to counteract what he saw as an overemphasis on creative activities in the teaching of art. In stressing the important functions that works of art perform, Smith found the writings of Monroe C. Beardsley on aesthetic experience particularly helpful, although he now believes that a number of theories of aesthetic experience are useful for understanding our commerce with works of art. Because of its analysis of a range of concepts that figure in our understanding of art, philosophical aesthetics (the philosophy of art) has proven to be a valuable resource for thinking about the problems of art education. Quite early, then, Smith saw the relevance of aesthetics —now one of the disciplines of DBAE—for the teaching of art.

However, the context in which we now think about the relevance of disciplines to the teaching of art has changed. The atmosphere has become politically charged, and what we now have is a new pluralism that encompasses multicultural, minority, and women's studies, interest in popular culture, and varieties of critical theory, or neo-Marxism generally. The originators of the idea of DBAE are, accordingly, being asked to reflect these interests. Smith's position is that alternative conceptions of DBAE are fine as long as they do not compromise art's special aesthetic character or discredit the history of artistic accomplishment. Education must cultivate an appreciation of art's great moments. Yet, politicizing art education threatens this.

Smith then sketched an ideal, or prototype, curriculum that retains what he thinks is best in our conventional thinking about art education, while accommodating new interests. Citing the British aesthetician Harold Osborne, Smith suggested that one might consider the task of art education to be to help young people to "live and move in the world of art, mingling with its inhabitants as persons of sensitivity and tact." This, in turn, suggests an image of curriculum as itinerary in which the teacher of art (functioning analogously as an art critic) prepares the young to traverse the art world.

Such a curriculum, Smith thinks, should have a global character, but for American youth it should feature the cultural heritage of Western civilization. At all times, one should cultivate an attitude that values aesthetic quality and excellence.

Since DBAE stresses the relevance of a number of academic disciplines, Smith says that it is, in effect, recommending a humanities interpretation of art education and the teaching of art as a humanity. Following Albert William Levi, Smith recommends a curriculum that combines the general goals of the humanities—to communicate effectively with one another, to think critically, to walk proudly with one's cultural heritage—with the purposes of visual art education—and to appreciate works of art for the sake of the worthwhile experience that they, at their best, are capable of providing. Teaching art as a humanity thus involves bringing to bear on the objectives of aesthetic learning, the arts of communication (art as a language and the literature about it), the arts of continuity (art history), the arts of criticism (art criticism), the arts of philosophical reflection (aesthetics), and the arts of creation (artistic production). These *arts*—ways of organizing human experience and their associated disciplines—represent Levi's and Smith's redefinition of the traditional liberal arts and humanities for today's world.

Smith describes four phases of aesthetic learning. In the first phase (kindergarten through grade three), teachers help develop an elementary sense of art by appealing to the natural capacity of children to take delight in the aesthetic qualities of natural phenomena and man-made artifacts. One can develop a greater awareness of such qualities through a variety of creative and perceptual activities. During phase two (grades four through six), teaching centers on the perception of artworks, on their subject, form, content, expressiveness, style, and their interrelations. Phase three (grades seven through nine) builds on the first two phases and stresses the acquisition of a sense of art history.

In phase four (grades ten through twelve), the task of teaching and learning is twofold: the appreciation, in the best sense of the term, of a selection of major works and masterpieces; and the formulation of the rudiments of a personal philosophy of art. It is during this phase of aesthetic learning that Smith thinks it is best to include the comparative study and appreciation of Western and non-Western works of art; students will already have gained some awareness of non-Western works from phase three. This is also the time to teach some formal aesthetics. Such study would be particularly helpful to students as they try to clarify their own ideas about art. Smith adds that such a view of curriculum is his own and not necessarily that of the Getty Center.

Referring once more to the new pluralism and his interpretation of art education, Smith stated his belief that certain things are not optional. These include an emphasis on excellence, initiation into the cultural heritage of Western civilization, the teaching of art as a humanity, and the progression of learning through phases. Smith

emphasized, however, that nothing he recommends excludes the teaching of an awareness of the arts of different groups and cultures. Nor are creative activities denied an important role. Above all, however, DBAE must resist forces that would deprive works of art of any privileged status, or which, in Beardsley's terms, would attempt "to control, distort, repress, or trivialize them."

Summary of Remarks
by Mary Ann Stankiewicz

A representative of the second generation of art educators, Mary Ann Stankiewicz concentrated on three things in her presentation: the concepts of generation and inheritance; conference expectations; and questions about teacher preparation.

The term *generation* has been used to identify a group of people of about the same age who are distinguished from other groups by their shared experiences. Annie Kriegel identifies three segments in any generation to explain why some members constitute a generational group while others do not. The first segment is "struck by an event as if by lightning"; people reorder their lives in relation to the event. The second segment turns the event into nostalgia; members do not define themselves by it. Finally, the third segment retains almost nothing of the event. Among these three generational segments, it is the first group whose members display the characteristics of a new period.

The first generation in art education laid the foundations for what is now known as DBAE. Those at the conference who are second-generation art educators were the graduate and undergraduate students of these early architects of the theory. Stankiewicz noted that, as members of the second generation, she and her colleagues also have shaped their careers in response to a decisive encounter. Indeed, she found it difficult to label conference participants by generation, since what many first-, second-, and third-generation participants

had in common was that they were shaping their professional lives around what they had learned about the "new, improved art education."

In considering the implications of inheritance, Stankiewicz noted that an inheritance either can be saved like a cut-glass vase in a china cabinet, or used as a means of exploring new territory, while maintaining ties to the past. In either case, for the next generation to receive its inheritance, the previous generation must let go. "I, for one, am not ready to do that," said Stankiewicz.

The idea of theory also is problematic, and calling DBAE a theory at this point is more honorific than descriptive, said Stankiewicz. She likens it to an ideology. Given the cognitive dissonance of the conference title, "Inheriting the Theory," and its aim, to promote new voices and multiple perspectives, Stankiewicz suggested renaming it "Participating in Critical Dialogue."

Stankiewicz found the conference participants almost evenly divided between those with expectations of gaining new ideas and perspectives and those who hoped to clarify and deepen ideas already held—perhaps an indication of a generation gap. A few expected to be able to present insights from their personal perspectives; all of these were women, suggesting that women are finding their voice in the field.

Stankiewicz noted several issues that seem to call for further critical dialogue. The first, arising from Triangulation #1, was the context of post-modernism and post-formalism. If we have entered a post-modern era, should formalist approaches, such as the aesthetic theory of modernism, continue to drive the curriculum? DBAE itself is a post-modern phenomenon and must allow for multiple perspectives on how we learn about art.

The second issue is the status of knowledge in the disciplines. The nature of knowledge and how we know is itself in question, and curriculum no longer can depend exclusively on traditional concepts of the disciplines; we must confront the plastic nature of knowledge. The need for a variety of approaches becomes even clearer when we consider the integration of multiculturalism into the curriculum. Stankiewicz advocates models based on some degree of relativism, with a systematic study of examples of material culture and a critical analysis of objects. Such models must share a common core that is discipline-based.

It was evident there was a need for continuing dialogue among the groups at the conference, particularly among museum educators, art educators, and discipline specialists. Each discipline is distinct, but also related; Stankiewicz stressed the need for individuals to communicate with each other about their special areas of expertise and their particular contributions to DBAE.

The last issue concerned the intrinsic rewards that students should gain from DBAE. Speaking of Mihaly Csikszentmihaly's "flow experiences," Stankiewicz commented that we should gear all the models of DBAE toward helping students learn to make life-changing art experiences for themselves and others.

Stankiewicz concluded by saying that the duty of the first, second, and third genera-

tions is not to hand the fourth generation a brick of knowledge to be safely stored away in the china cabinet, but to encourage its members to participate in critical dialogue. We need to join with them to explore new territory while maintaining ties with old friends.

Summary of "Remarks from the Third Generation"

After the seminar, the twelve graduate student participants collaborated on a summary of the conference from their perspective as representatives of the next generation of educators. The text of the document was prepared by Donna Kay Beattie.

Accepting their theoretical inheritance with enthusiasm, the co-authors of this document are particularly grateful that, while DBAE is a sturdy and functional approach to teaching and learning, it is also flexible and allows for multiple perspectives. It is crucial, they feel, that DBAE not become a particular curriculum but, instead, serve as a sturdy theoretical foundation for a plethora of sound curricula.

The new high-tech media have changed forever previous conceptions of art, and the boundaries between fine and populist art have become hazier. The new generation welcomes the intrusion of contemporary art forms into DBAE programs, a phenomenon that was implicit in the presentations of Triangulation #1. A broad range of art forms and materials provide a means for exploring diverse aesthetic theories and creating new ones. DBAE must be broad enough to embrace the best of the new art disciplines along with the best of the fine arts.

DBAE theory also must be open to the latest findings in the cognitive sciences, as discussed in Triangulation #2, and a primary goal of the newest generation should be to teach a method, or methods, of inquiry. Teachers must be trained in teaching processes; they must learn frequently to

relinquish the role of instructor and encourage learner-initiated outcomes, so that the developmental needs, societal needs, and interests of the learners will not be overlooked.

The graduate students agree with Koroscik that DBAE must not become compartmentalized. The four disciplines must be integrated in teaching practice, with teachers assuming many of the postures of the artist, the historian, the aesthetician, and the critic, to encourage similar understandings on the part of learners.

In Triangulation #3, Maquet provided a viable way, not only for learning about visual objects cross-culturally, but also for establishing criteria for selecting appropriate artifacts. Katter proposed a matrix-like model for gaining a global perspective by looking at Maquet's "universal," "cultural," and "individual" perspectives through the four components of a work of art—the art object, the artist, the audience, and the context—with the art object recommended as the core of a DBAE curriculum. The dangers, as the graduate students see them, are twofold. First, making the art object central to the total art experience may make learning experiences fragmented, nonsequential, and shallow. Although the group strongly favors including multicultural works within the DBAE curriculum, the "a different culture a week" type of global art program must be avoided. Second, an art object-centered curriculum is apt to neglect the learner's own experiences and feelings. A solution to the first problem is to introduce a limited number of artifacts for in-depth study in all four disciplines. The second problem might be solved by combining the art object and the artist components in the core curriculum through a multicultural program that uses universal themes to cut across forms, styles, movements. Most important, it must be understood that multicultural education is a state of mind. While DBAE models for a multicultural curriculum would be helpful, it is more essential to encourage a global mentality within the current parameters of DBAE.

The next generation believes strongly that aesthetics, the topic of the Triangulation #4 presentations, rightly belongs in the balanced art program and that, in tandem with criticism, it can be taught in the classroom, even to young learners. This stance was reinforced by Reed's description of a successful program designed to teach children the rudiments of philosophical inquiry. Yenawine clearly pointed out that teachers and learners generally lack knowledge of aesthetic issues; future DBAE theory and curricular development must address this problem.

Implicit in Triangulation #5 was the assumption that effective teaching within a DBAE context may be comprised of many qualities. Yet there was little apparent consensus about what these qualities were. Wilson suggested that merely knowing DBAE theory is not enough. Research in the field must identify and examine how effectively DBAE teachers function within the context of their own classrooms, in order to develop a clear picture of what effective DBAE teaching looks like.

Assessment in DBAE was the least satisfactorily covered topic in this session. While Maitland-Gholson cautioned against adopting current testing and measurement theory and practices on the premise that they have been largely unsuccessful in general education, she noted that standardized norm-referenced tests can be useful in DBAE if one discards traditional conceptions and introduces fresh insights. The need to develop an assessment theory, procedures, and instruments in conjunction with DBAE curricula requires continued study and research.

In Triangulation #6, Smith added to the diversity of discipline-based perspectives by offering yet another definition of DBAE theory and suggesting that art education address pluralism through a humanities approach. He proposes replacing the four DBAE disciplines with the four "arts": communication, continuity, criticism, and creation/performance. But these content categories are extremely difficult to define as curriculum concepts, and art under the humanities label might easily be subsumed into a social studies curriculum. The new generation feels strongly that pluralism must be addressed within the parameters of existing DBAE theory.

Stankiewicz questioned whether DBAE's embracing of formalist approaches to aesthetic perception and art criticism, though suitable for modernism, is appropriate for DBAE, a post-modern phenomenon. Yet DBAE seems to be built on adequate theoretical constructs. For example, the original DBAE monograph printed in the *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (1987) suggests a fourfold strategy for coping:

1) review the monograph's extensive bibliography and notes that expand discussion;

2) explore a great number of examples of discipline-based curricula that illustrate an appropriate range for communicating the concept or issue;

3) obtain input from content expert specialists in each of the art disciplines, educational psychology, and educational philosophy;

4) establish theoretical constructs from a broad range of disciplines in art and education.

Throughout the seminar, the twelve representatives of the next generation of art educators were constantly reminded that DBAE is an ever-renewing theory capable of adapting to new generations, new settings, new times. They believe that exploring change while valuing continuity is their legacy and responsibility to the "fourth generation."

In closing, they expressed their gratitude for the opportunity to attend and participate fully in the dialogue, debate, and networking that characterized the seminar. It is their hope that they can take what was offered at Austin and implement it in the transformation of DBAE theory into teaching practice.

Special Session

Special Session:
An Unexpected Educational Outcome: Questioning the Theory

One of the major purposes of Issues Seminars is to provide opportunities for the art education community to discuss and debate issues concerning the continuing evolution of DBAE. To that end, we made time and space available to a group of approximately 30 of the 130 seminar participants who asked to meet outside the parameters of the planned agenda to discuss their concerns and reservations about DBAE. Following are the minutes from that meeting, as written by the individuals who organized the session, and the Center's response to the issues and concerns brought up during the discussion.

Concerns and Reservations about DBAE
Drafted and submitted by Kristin G. Congdon, Laurie E. Hicks, Harold McWhinnie, W. Jackson Rushing, Amy Brook Snider, and Donald Soucy, with the assistance of Phillip Charles Dunn

On Sunday morning a group of approximately thirty seminar participants met to discuss their concerns about "Inheriting the Theory." During the discussion, these concerns were treated as interrelated, but for purposes of clarity, they are summarized here under three main themes. This summation is intended to reflect the comments and diverse viewpoints of discussion participants; the intention here is not to identify a single position. Rather, we hope that by including this discussion in the seminar proceedings, new voices and dialogues will truly be heard, now and in the future.

The Goals, Responsibilities, and Power of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts
Questions on the funding practices of the Getty Center were central to the discussion. These questions included

1) Is it possible for the Getty Center to support art education models other than DBAE, and if so, should it do so?

2) Does the Getty Center have a responsibility to support inquiry in art education that focuses on feminism, multiculturalism, postmodernism, etc., or, in other words, to democratize its funding?

3) If such support is possible, what is the

procedure for acquiring it?

Responses to these questions indicated that, whereas public grantmaking organizations, such as the National Endowment for the Arts, are required to entertain a variety of ideas and approaches, private operating foundations, such as the Getty Trust, need not do so. Free of these constraints, the Getty Center has chosen to identify and promote one particular model, DBAE. It made this choice based on a Rand Corporation study on the condition of art education in the United States. The Center does offer small Special Initiative Grants for research and development but only for projects that fall within the general DBAE model.

Related questions arose concerning political ramifications of the Getty Center's "buying power." Because of the money available to the Center for publicity and program development, the ideas it promotes become very visible. These ideas, regardless of their validity, can be accepted simply because of this high visibility. Moreover, approaches that do not fit within DBAE, such as multicultural art education, are at a disadvantage because they do not receive funding comparable to that given by the Getty Center. There was concern that the apparent necessity to address non-DBAE issues within the DBAE model could lead to the neutralization of their importance. One participant stated that if the Getty Center wanted to promote true intellectual inquiry, then it should encourage discussion of relevant issues such as feminism, multiculturalism, post-modernism, or deconstruction for their own sake, without always requiring that they be related to DBAE.

One participant pointed out that interest in DBAE-like ideas cannot be attributed solely to the influence of the Getty Center. For example, many states have adopted or adapted the California Framework for Visual and Performing Arts, K-12, which, though it was created during the 1970s, is very convergent with the tenets of DBAE. Another example is the National Art Education Association Quality Goals Statement, a document that is also convergent with DBAE, but which was created entirely outside of the Getty Center's activities. Furthermore, the Getty Center is the smallest entity in the J. Paul Getty Trust, and its funding is probably less than most people believe. However, it was noted that the influence of the Getty Center extends beyond the direct results of its funding. For example, state departments of education, influenced by the publicity and publications generated by the Getty Center, have begun to mandate DBAE programming at all elementary and secondary levels. In addition, ever since the Center began this project, DBAE has become much more prevalent in art education literature and a central focus at state and national conventions. Discussions about art education approaches do not even seem to take place anymore without reference or juxtaposition of issues to DBAE.

The Concept of DBAE

One participant said she did not want to "inherit the theory"; she wanted to change

it. Some argued that we should not refer to DBAE as one specific theory, since notions about DBAE are so broad and vague and since there are so many interpretations of what DBAE actually is. Others disagreed, saying that DBAE, as it is articulated by the Getty Center, encompasses a specific set of general principles.

This led to a discussion about whether DBAE was flexible or limiting. A number of participants felt that the limitations of its structure and curricular developments ignored or marginalized ways of thinking and being that are not within the canon of Western European arts, a canon that is elitist and reifies white, male-dominated forms of thought and representation. Several participants disagreed with this view. They felt that DBAE was broad enough to allow for the incorporation of "whatever issues you like." "But if that is the case," one participant responded, "then perhaps DBAE is more of a marketing slogan than a theory." These comments were followed by a discussion of how DBAE's structure may itself be antithetical to feminist, post-modern, or multicultural/pluralistic concerns, and that educational programs that include these concerns would not look like the DBAE model. One participant suggested that DBAE, by ignoring issues such as social concerns and by maintaining a modernist and/or formalist stance, presents itself as being outside the social and political contexts in which art is created, viewed, and taught. It was pointed out that in presenting art and art education as socially and politically neutral, DBAE is contributing to the disempowerment of students.

The Seminar

Another concern of the discussion was the symbolic nature of the seminar's opening session, which had introduced participants to "integrated adult role models" as a way of marking the format and direction of the conference program. It was noted that no women, people of color, or people experiencing disability were offered as role models of the integrated adult.

These minutes are intended to reflect the comments and concerns of discussion participants. They attempt to present the complexity of viewpoints represented by the group, not to identify a single position. It is hoped that by including this discussion in the proceedings of "Inheriting the Theory," new voices and dialogues will truly be heard, now and in the future.

A Response to "Questioning the Theory"

by Phillip Charles Dunn, Program Officer, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts seeks to encourage constructive debate about improving art education. We appreciate the perspective of those individuals attending the Issues Seminar who participated in this session.

Participants in the special session, "Questioning the Theory," discussed five questions related to the function and purposes of the J. Paul Getty Trust, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, and the theoretical constructs of DBAE. Because these are important questions that should be addressed, the Center is pleased to offer this response to enable others to understand more fully its mission and commitment to art education.

1) "Why does the Getty Center support DBAE to the exclusion of other approaches to art education?"

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust, was established in 1982, following a year-long examination of the substance and quality of public school arts programs, particularly those in the visual arts. Before developing its own program initiatives, the Center wanted to understand better why arts education was accorded low status in many of the nation's schools. This review was useful in identifying many of the features characterizing arts education content and practice. Chief among these was the traditional emphasis in visual arts education on fostering creative expression and developing artistic or hands-on studio production skills.

At the end of this review, the Center concluded that if art education is to become a more meaningful part of the core curriculum of general education, it must embrace both the making of art and the appreciation of art. In addition to attending to the self-expressive studio component, we need to expand the content of the art education curriculum to enable children, not only to make art, but also to understand, respond to, and interpret the meanings and beauty of the arts.

The Center has chosen to approach art education through the program now known as discipline-based art education (DBAE). This approach calls for the integration of ideas and skills from four foundational art disciplines: studio production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics.

DBAE provides an opportunity for art education to move from the sidelines of instruction to a more central place in a balanced school curriculum. In order for this to happen, however, art education needs to include content from the above disciplines, which augment the making and the understanding of art. Each develops knowledge and skills that contribute significantly, not only to the artistic creations of children but also to the ability of children to draw facts from and make inferences about the cultural and historical contexts of art and to analyze and interpret the powerful

ideas communicated by works of art.

In keeping with the knowledge that there is no single correct way to reach any subject, DBAE encourages a variety of pedagogical approaches to teaching art. This holistic viewpoint in constructing art experiences for children suggests that: art be taught on a regular and ongoing basis; the art curriculum be adopted at the school district level; specific art curricula that are adopted or created by the school district devote significant attention to each of the four disciplines; learning be sequenced according to learning styles and levels of human development; and student achievement in art be assessed.

The Center believes that DBAE represents a viable paradigm for teaching art and has chosen to support its development over the past seven years because of the contributions it is making to children's more comprehensive understanding of art.

2) "Is DBAE antithetical to feminist, postmodern, or multicultural/pluralistic concerns?"

DBAE theory does not contain constructs that preclude art educators from embracing these concerns. Art educators should develop discipline-based curricula that attend to the unique student composition of individual school districts. The curricula should also include cultural and social issues that address the widest possible composition of student populations. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts encourages art educators to experiment in constructing their own approaches to DBAE to reflect artistic, social, and multicultural issues.

Discipline-based approaches should include a variety of works of art from Western and non-Western cultures, ranging from the most ancient through the post-modern eras. Currently, there is a dearth of reproductions of multicultural works of art available to teachers. The Center's Multicultural Art Prints Series (MAPS) is a co-venture with a commercial publisher to augment reproductions of multicultural images currently available to teachers. Over the next few years, we expect that the series will include at least fifty multicultural images, complete with information about the historical and cultural contexts, studio practices, aesthetics, and criteria for art criticism of each work.

Another example of the Center's commitment to encouraging the development of DBAE lessons that address multicultural art is the Curriculum Development Institute. The objective of this initiative is to enable art specialists, museum educators, curriculum development experts, and experts from each of the four foundational art disciplines to work together to develop a series of prototype lesson units for teachers to examine, adapt, and experiment with as they create versions of DBAE for their own school districts. Each of these units will provide a different approach to designing a DBAE program and will address many of the concerns expressed in Question #2.

3) "Because of its buying power, the ideas that the Getty Center promotes become very visible. Are these ideas being accepted

because they are valid or because of their high visibility? Do approaches that do not fall within the parameters of DBAE become disadvantaged since they are not payrolled by wealth similar to that of the Getty Center?"

Much of the acceptance of DBAE is a consequence of its having been examined and approved by both art educators and education policy makers, who have found it to be a viable and substantive approach. National organizations, such as the College Board, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Endowment for the Arts, and many state departments of education, support a comprehensive, multicultural approach because it seeks to provide content and skills that enable children to produce, comprehend, and respond to their own works of art and the works of others. The level of visibility that accompanies this approach has also been heightened by the congruence of DBAE and the Quality Goals Statement of the National Art Education Association and many state curriculum frameworks for arts education.

Other approaches to art education that do not fall within the parameters of DBAE do not seem to be disadvantaged because of the Center's support for DBAE. Rather, just the opposite seems to be true. The Center's activities have helped to promote the value of art education in general, as well as DBAE in particular. Alternatives to DBAE have been given additional visibility and support because the Center's efforts on behalf of art education have sensitized other funders, including the Rockefeller, Galeff, and Warhol foundations, to the need for additional support for art education.

4) "Is DBAE limiting or flexible as a theoretical approach?"

DBAE is one of several approaches to art education. It has broad parameters which give teachers and other curriculum developers considerable room for creativity and flexibility. The tenets of DBAE include the following: art is a serious subject of study; art must function as a part of general education; the curriculum in art should be written and should draw its content from four foundational disciplines that comprise art; and concepts taught should be sequenced and cumulative to permit a variety of ways for teachers to assess the children's knowledge of art, including the creative manipulation of materials to produce unique and personal works of art. It is specifically the responsibility of curriculum developers and teachers to determine how they should sequence and present concepts to children. DBAE may, thus, be tailored to fit a variety of teaching situations and differing individual learning modalities.

In reality, DBAE is a conceptual approach that does not contain only one specific curriculum or pedagogy for teaching art. It would have been ideal if discipline-based practice had been born fully matured. But in the real world, that seldom, if ever, happens, and the development of educational practices generally lags behind their underlying theoretical constructs. As teach-

ers translate these constructs into practices in classrooms, they help to elaborate and inform the tenets upon which the theory is based. One of the most important things the Center has learned during the past seven years is that theory needs to continue to evolve in order for it to remain viable. The purpose of convening seminars such as this one is to provide another opportunity for that evolution to continue.

5) "During the opening session, why were no women, people of color, or people experiencing disabilities offered as role models of the integrated adult?"

It was certainly not the intent of the planning committee or the Center for Education in the Arts to exclude women, people of color, or disabled individuals from the opening session of this seminar. Rather, the intent was to call upon individuals with expertise in the topic that was chosen for discussion in the opening session.

Participants

SEMINAR DIRECTOR

Maurice Sevigny
Chairman
Department of Fine and Performing Arts
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Paul Bolin
Department of Art
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR

Anne El-Omami
Cincinnati Art Museum
Cincinnati, OH

Marilyn Stewart
Department of Art Education
Kutztown University
Kutztown, PA

PRESENTERS

John S. Crawford
Department of Art History
University of Delaware
Newark, DE

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi
Department of Behavioral Sciences
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL

Ed Emshwiller
Dean, School of Film and Video
California Institute of the Arts
Valencia, CA

E. Barry Gaither
Director
Museum of the National Center for Afro-American Artists
Boston, MA

John G. Hanhardt
Head, Film and Video
Whitney Museum of American Art
New York, NY

Eldon Katter
Art Education Department
Kutztown University
Kutztown, PA

Judith Koroscik
Department of Art Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Jane Maitland-Gholson
Department of Art Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR

Jacques Maquet
Anthropology Department
University of California
Los Angeles, CA

Ronald Reed
Visiting Professor
Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children
Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, NJ
Analytic Teaching Center
Texas Wesleyan College
Fort Worth, TX

Richard Shiff
Center for the Interdisciplinary Study of Modernism
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Thomas J. Shuell
Department of Counseling and Education Psychology
State University of New York
Buffalo, NY

Ralph A. Smith
College of Education
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL

Mary Ann Stankiewicz
Department of Art
California State University
Long Beach, CA

Suzanne M. Wilson
Department of Teacher Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI

101

Philip Yenawine
Department of Education
Museum of Modern Art
New York, NY

NATIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Kay Alexander
Independent Art Consultant
Los Altos, CA

Patricia Amburgy
Department of Art Education
Pennsylvania State University
State College, PA

Terry Barrett
Art Education Department
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Nancy Berry
Dallas Museum of Art
Dallas, TX

Sharon Blume
Director of Education
The Museum of the Moving Image
Astoria, NY

Diane Brigham
Department of Education
J. Paul Getty Museum
Malibu, CA

Joyce Brodsky
Art Department
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT

Judith Madden Bryant
Portland Public Schools
Portland, OR

Margaret Burchenal
Department of Education
Museum of Fine Arts
Boston, MA

Ann Calvert
Department of Fine Arts
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

John C. Chamberlin
Department of Art Education
Rhode Island School of Design
Providence, RI

Jerilynn Changar
Department of Education
Washington University
St. Louis, MO

Gilbert Clark
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

James M. Clarke
Aldine Independent School District
Houston, TX

Faith Clover
Portland Public Schools
Portland, OR

Carolyn Cochrane
Eugene 4J School District
Eugene, OR

Georgia Collins
Department of Art
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY

Kristin G. Congdon
Community Arts Program
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL

Lila Crespin
Arts Consultant
Corona del Mar, CA

Michael D. Day
Department of Art
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT

Margaret DiBlasio
Department of Art Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Sandra Epps
Multicultural Arts Coordinator
Community School District #5
New York, NY

Mary Erickson
Department of Art
Kutztown University
Kutztown, PA

Linda F. Ettinger
Department of Art
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR

Dennis Fehr
Department of Education
University of Houston
Houston, TX

Hermine Feinstein
School of Art
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

Paulette S. Fleming
Department of Art
California State University, Fresno
Fresno, CA

George Geahigan
Creative Arts Department
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN

Glenda Gentry
California State Visual and Performing Arts Staff Development Center
San Rafael, CA

W. Dwaine Greer
Department of Art
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Sally Hagaman
Department of Art
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN

Laurie E. Hicks
Department of Art
University of Maine
Orono, ME

Sharon Jacques
Museum of Modern Art
New York, NY

Andra N. Johnson
Department of Art
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

Larry A. Kantner
Department of Art
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO

Michael Kendall
Department of Fine Arts
Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, NJ

Beverly W. Krieger
Department of Art
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX

Richard LaTour
Curriculum and Instruction
Oregon Department of Education
Salem, OR

Denise Lauzier-Stone
Department of Art Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

Kent Lydecker
Art Institute of Chicago
Chicago, IL

Nancy MacGregor
Department of Art Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Stanley S. Madeja
College of Visual and Performing Arts
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL

William McCarter
Department of Art
University of North Texas
Denton, TX

Harold McWhinnie
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Connie Newton
Department of Art
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO

Janis Norman
Kansas City Art Institute
Kansas City, MO

Michael E. Ott
Department of Art
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

Sarah Otto-Diniz
Art in the School, Inc.
Albuquerque, NM

Michael Parsons
Department of Art Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Jennifer Pazienza
Department of Art
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, WI

Judith Perry
Portland School District
Portland, OR

Joan Peterson
Visual and Performing Arts
Consultant
Superintendent of Public Instruction
California State Department
of Education
Sacramento, CA

Martin P. Rayala
Art Education Consultant
Curriculum Development Section
Wisconsin Department of Public
Instruction
Madison, WI

Mindy J. Richman
Program Specialist
National Endowment for the Arts
Washington, DC

Martin Rosenberg
Art Department
University of Nebraska
Omaha, NE

W. Jackson Rushing
Art Department
University of Maine
Orono, ME

Robert L. Russell
Department of Arts Education
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

J. Russell Sale
National Gallery of Art
Washington, DC

Renee Sandell
Department of Art Education
Maryland Institute College of Art
Baltimore, MD

Jon W. Sharer
School of Art
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ

Robert Sitton
Portland Public Schools
Portland, OR

Amy Brook Snider
Department of Art Education
Pratt Institute
New York, NY

Donald Soucy
Faculty of Education
University of New Brunswick
Fredericton, NB, Canada

Marvin Spomer
Department of Curriculum and
Instruction
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Lincoln, NE

Mary Stokrocki
Art Department
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, OH

Christine Thompson
Department of Art
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL

Frances Thurber
Department of Art
University of Nebraska
Omaha, NE

Barbara J. Weinstein
Allentown School District
Allentown, PA

Enid Zimmerman
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

LOCAL PARTICIPANTS

Rebecca Brooks
Department of Art
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Sandra Gregor
Director
Texas Fine Arts Association
Austin, TX

William Hoey
Department of Art
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Susan Mayer
Department of Art
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Al Nickel
Department of Art
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Becky Reese
Huntington Art Gallery
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Jeanne Rollins
Art Specialist
Texas Education Agency
Division of Curriculum Development
Austin, TX

Mary P. Taylor
Department of Art
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

Robyn Turner
Senior Editor
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
Austin, TX

Jay Ulbricht
Department of Art
The University of Texas
Austin, TX

GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP PARTICIPANTS

Donna Kay Beattie
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

Susan R. Euler
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Lynn Galbraith
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Sharon R. Gray
Brigham Young University
Provo, UT

Elizabeth Kowalchuk
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Anna Martin
University of Houston
Houston, TX

Sally A. Myers
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Jeffery S. Seibert
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

Patricia Tinsman-Schaffer
Pennsylvania State University
State College, PA

Sydney Walker
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL

Trudy Wilson
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

Anne G. Wolcott
Pennsylvania State University
State College, PA

PERSONNEL
THE GETTY CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN THE ARTS

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director

Stephen Dobbs
Senior Program Officer

Phillip Charles Dunn
Program Officer

Vicki Rosenberg
Program Officer

CONFERENCE PLANNING
Anne Elmajan
Ogilvy & Mather Public Relations West
Los Angeles, CA

CONFERENCE DOCUMENTATION
Keens Company
New York, NY
William Keens, President

Recorders:
Katherine Carlson
Michael Griffin
Eloiese Krabbenhoft
Donna Lednicky
Mark L. Smith

FOR A LIMITED TIME, the complete texts of the six triangulation sessions of the Getty Center's second Issues Seminar, *Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE*, are available on two 5¼ inch high-density diskettes. Each set of diskettes includes presentations in the following software languages: Wordperfect 5.0, Wordstar 4.0 and ASCII format. The diskettes are available at no charge, one set per customer please. To receive the full texts on diskettes, complete the attached form and mail it to:

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts
1875 Century Park East
Suite 2300
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2561

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ORDER FORM

Please send me a set of two diskettes containing the complete texts of the six triangulation sessions of the Getty Center's second Issues Seminar, *Inheriting the Theory: New Voices and Multiple Perspectives on DBAE*.

NAME

ADDRESS
(If P.O. Box is given, please provide a daytime telephone number.)

CITY STATE ZIP CODE

YOUR DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER

AFFIX
STAMP
HERE

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts
1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2561